Library of

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY

BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.

THE

UNITED STATES

CATHOLIC MAGAZINE

AND MONTHLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1845.

IRELAND AND THE IRISH.

1. *The Condition and Fate of England.* "We think it would be a vast advantage to the public in general, if ingenious opticians would turn their attention to a remedy for that long-sighted benevolence which sweeps the distant horizon for objects of compassion, but is blind as a bat to the wretchedness and destitution abounding at their own doors."—Blackwood. "For a people to be free, they have only to *will* it." By the author of "the Glory and Shame of England," (C. Edwards Lester.) 2 vols., 12mo. Second edition. New York: J. & H. G. Langley. 1843.

2. *The Criminal History of the English Government, from the first massacre of the Irish to the poisoning of the Chinese.* By Eugene Regnault. Translated from the French, with Notes by an American. 1 vol. 12mo. New York: Redfield. 1843.

THAT great and dreadful day of the Lord, when nations as well as individuals shall be placed at the bar of God to be judged according to their works, England will have an awful account to render of her stewardship. Her impoverished and down-trodden population within her own borders, the crushed and degraded millions whom she has enslaved in India, and the widows and the orphans whom she has made throughout the world in her reckless career of ambition, will all rise up in judgment against her. The nations of the civilized earth will rise up against her, and will bear evidence to her hard hearted and relentless avarice, to her utter disregard of the most solemn promises and treaties, to her all-grasping spirit of aggrandizement, and to her entire recklessness as to the means by which her ends are to be attained.

But on that awful day of reckoning the voice of poor crushed and bleeding Ireland shall be heard pleading, with all the earnest eloquence of truth, that justice, swift and terrible, may at length fall on the head of that unnatural step-dame, to whose wanton cruelty, griping avarice, and iron policy, she owes most of the wrongs which have weighed her down for centuries.

What will England say when all these terrible witnesses shall appear against her, and when the ghosts of her countless murdered victims shall glare at her "with their fiery eye-balls," more terribly than did the ghost of Banquo? What answer shall she give when the long and dark roll of her iniquities towards Ireland shall be unfolded before the judgment-seat of the most just, omnipotent, and all-seeing God of heaven and earth? Will her diplomacy then avail her any thing? Will

those cunning devices and that political *leger-demain* by which, on this earth, she has so often succeeded in making "the worse appear the better cause," then avail her aught? No, no. The Lord will then tear from her brow the veil of hypocrisy which has so long concealed her hideous deformities; he will strip her of all disguise, and exhibit her as she is before the assembled world; for on that day "he will reveal the hidden things of darkness, and manifest the counsels of hearts."

One of the deepest thinkers and greatest luminaries of Christian antiquity * has laid down the comprehensive philosophical maxim, that "God is patient, because he is eternal," *patiens, quia æternus. He* can bide his time; *he* need be in no hurry, for he has a whole eternity to reward his friends, and a whole eternity to punish his enemies. A thousand years before him are as one day which has passed; time is as nothing; eternity is every thing. The wrongs which he permits in time he redresses in eternity. The injustice which he allows to go on, and the tears and blood which he permits to flow in time, he removes and wipes away in eternity. Then shall "all things be made new;" then shall all evils be obliterated from the universe of God; then "shall all tears be wiped away from the eyes (of God's friends), and death shall be no more; nor mourning, nor crying, nor sorrow shall be any more; for the former things will have passed away." † Then shall the high be brought low, and the low be made high; the proud humbled, and the humble exalted. Then shall all social and political evils be obliterated, and the social and moral condition of mankind be equalized and brought into perfect harmony with truth and justice and virtue. And then shall proud England be humbled even unto the dust, and poor bleeding Ireland, which has been down-trodden by her for nearly seven centuries, be raised up from her lowliness to the lofty eminence to which her noble virtues and her cruel sufferings have entitled her.

This is no mere flight of elevated fancy; it is a solemn and sober religious view of a subject invested with an all-absorbing interest. But is Ireland to await the award of the last day for a redress of her many crying grievances? We think not; we fervently trust that her condition is not so utterly hopeless. Until the present century, indeed, she had little to expect or hope from the justice of men, and was driven to the last resort which is left in this world to the weak when hopelessly crushed by the strong—an appeal to the great Father of the poor, and the great Avenger of guilt. Up to this period the gloom, which had settled heavily around her political horizon for long centuries, had been but partially lighted up by occasional gleams of hope; but these faint glimmerings of light, which had broken fitfully and at long intervals upon the ever-increasing darkness, had all disappeared with the suddenness of meteors, and had left the darkness still more heavy and palpable. But, thank God, better days and brighter hopes have dawned on Ireland during the last twenty years; the day-star of liberty and nationality has already risen on her children, and the period, we fondly hope, is not distant, when the blessed sun of freedom itself shall shed his full light on the "sweetest island which ever gemmed the ocean."

Perhaps the most cheering sign of the times is the fact that the civilized nations of the earth have lately risen up to demand justice for Ireland. England has been cited to the bar of universal public opinion to give a rigorous account of the long and dark catalogue of iniquities which, to the everlasting shame and disgrace of humanity itself, she has been for centuries committing in the sister island. The sharp and withering rebuke thus administered to her can not fail to have its effect even on her unyielding and iron nature. While Ireland is agitated from one extremity to the other, and the whole civilized world is looking on with sympathy for her wrongs, England will scarcely *dare* continue much longer her system of high-handed injustice. Let Ireland but continue her noble struggle for freedom, and let all the lovers of the right, and all the enemies of oppression throughout the world, extend to her their warm sympathy and cordial aid, and England, for very shame, must speedily desist from her iniquitous course of legislation, and grant justice to Ireland. She never will grant it, unless she be compelled to do so by domestic or foreign difficulties, or by the united voice of the civilized world. Her whole course of policy for many ages past proves this; she has never been known to

* St. Augustine. † Apocalypse xxi, 4.

forego any advantage, to relinquish any claim, or to desist from any injustice, no matter how crying, unless and until she was forced to do so by stern necessity. She never would have granted Catholic emancipation, had she not felt compelled to do it by circumstances.

The two writers, the titles of whose works stand at the head of our paper, give strong expression to the indignant feelings of large masses of persons in America and France, awakened by the iniquitous policy of England, both domestic and foreign. They both trace the mischievous influences of English legislation on the happiness of very large portions of her own exuberant population, and the wickedness of English diplomacy in regard to other nations; and they both devote separate books or chapters to the aggravated wrongs of Ireland under English misrule. They deal not in mere declamation; they strongly appeal to unquestionable facts. Their works prove that sober facts speak a language more eloquent than any exaggeration or fiction. They paint England in her towering greatness and in her burning shame; they prove, by evidence which can not be answered, that she has become great by employing the most unhallowed means, and that her glory is mainly built upon the impoverishment, the degradation, and the ruin of her own subjects at home and abroad, and on the perfidy which has almost invariably marked her intercourse with other nations.

To us it has always seemed that there exists a striking parallelism between the policy and history of the present British and those of the ancient Roman empire. Both attained to the highest pinnacle of grandeur and power, and by very nearly the same means. Cunning diplomacy and brute force, insatiate avarice and unquenchable ambition, iron energy and unconquerable will, are the distinctive characteristics of both, as well as the secret of their success. Both seemed to have adopted, as a guiding maxim, the old adage, *Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum;* that is, according to its original meaning and acceptation, "let the *law* take its course though the heavens should fall." No matter how many nations and people may lie crushed and bleeding; no matter how much injustice may be perpetrated; no matter how many widows and orphans may be made; no matter how many tears and how much blood may be shed; let the law, which we have enacted for our own aggrandizement, still sternly take its course! Let our iron will be obeyed, though the whole world should lie prostrate and be covered with ruin and desolation! In both empires we trace the same grasping ambition, the same inhuman crushing of conquered provinces, the same spirit of centralization, the same union of church and state, and its concomitant, religious persecution; and, in fine, the same all-conquering spirit. The Roman was an empire of iron, and yet it has crumbled into dust; it became drunk with the blood of the saints, and filled up the measure of its iniquities, and then God chastised it in his wrath. Let proud England think on the chastisement, and take warning! Pagan Rome was permitted to persecute the church but *three hundred years*, and then had she to bite the dust, and be scourged and humbled for her wickedness, and her impious attempt to put down the truth!

But our business lies at present with Ireland. Ireland! how the very name thrills through the soul, and stirs the deepest fountains of its sympathy! How many mournful recollections does it not awaken! Who, that has but one spark of generosity yet glowing in his bosom, has not felt his spirit burn within him at the sad rehearsal of Ireland's wrongs! Is there one *man* on the face of the earth who can hear that story unmoved? Is there one who has not shared, to a greater or less extent, in the tender feelings embodied in the following touching lines of Erin's sweetest, greatest poet?

"The stranger shall hear thy lament o'er his plains;
The sigh of thy harp shall be sent o'er the deep,
Till thy tyrants themselves, as they rivet thy chains,
Shall pause o'er the songs of their captives, and weep."

Though England has labored, for nearly seven centuries, to destroy her nationality, yet is Ireland still a nation. She has not, it is true, a domestic legislature, and she enjoys not political independence; but she still has her national literature, her national poetry, her national eloquence, her national spirit, her national patriotism. She still lives, breathes, feels, moves, and acts as a nation. England may bow down, she can not destroy, her national character. Brute force may subdue the bodies, it can not trammel the souls of Irishmen. If the spirit of Ireland could have been broken, seven centuries of the most galling

oppression would have broken it; but, thank God, that spirit is still as buoyant, as elastic, as independent, as ever. It hates oppression as much as it ever did; it kisses not the rod which scourges it; it can not be won by bribery, nor conquered by physical force.

"Ireland still has an existence as a nation. She has her universities and her literature. She is still the "Emerald isle of the ocean.' An air of romance and chivalry is around her. The traditionary tales that live in her literature invest her history with heroic beauty. But she has no need of these. Real heroes, the O'Neills, the O'Briens, and the Emmets, will be remembered as long as self-denying patriotism and unconquerable valor are honored among men. In every department of literature she still takes her place. Where is the wreath her shamrock does not adorn? Where the muse that has not visited her hills? Her harp has ever kindled the soul of the warrior, and soothed the sorrows of the broken-hearted. It has sounded every strain that can move the human heart to greatness, or to love. Whatever vices may stain her people, they are free from the crime of voluntary servitude. *The Irishman is the man last to be subdued.* Possessing an elasticity of character that will rise under the heaviest oppression, he wants only a favorable opportunity and a single spark to set him in a blaze."*

Such is the language of an intelligent American, a Protestant, and a son of the pilgrims; of one who is as liberal in his opinions, as he is fearless in the expression of them. Wide and expansive in his views, generous in his feelings, and truly American in his mind and heart, Mr. Lester seems wholly incapable of any narrow or unworthy prejudices. All nations, and tribes, and peoples, are the same to him. He is a man, and nothing that is human is shut out from his sympathy. Wherever he finds wrong and injustice, his soul melts with compassion, and his spirit kindles with honest indignation against the oppressor. If he hates England, he furnishes abundant reasons for his hatred. If he sympathizes with Ireland, he proves that Ireland is worthy of sympathy. His book on "Ireland under English oppression"† is one of the most eloquent and conclusive essays we have ever chanced to read.

We fervently wish that every American had his honest independence and his generous feelings. We wish that every American citizen were as true to the letter and to the spirit of our noble constitution, and to the principles embodied in our declaration of independence. We wish that all were disposed cheerfully to extend a succoring hand to the oppressed of every nation under the sun, and to visit oppression, no matter where found, with the scorn and indignation which it merits. But, alas! such is not the case. Disguise the fact as we may, there exists in the minds of a large portion of our population a secret, instinctive, indefinable hatred of Ireland, and contempt of every thing Irish; and, along with this feeling, an overweening partiality for England and for every thing English. Our political harangues and fourth of July orations are high sounding and comprehensive enough; they abound in withering denunciations of tyranny and of tyrants, and are well garnished with expressions of sympathy for the victims of oppression. But the sufferings of poor Ireland under a most atrocious and grinding English oppression are often left out of the account!

We boast of our independence; we sound forth the praises of our revolutionary fathers who broke the trammels of English oppression, and bequeathed the rich inheritance of liberty to their descendants. We are honest and right in this patriotic boast. But are we really independent of England? Have we entirely shaken off her yoke? Do we enjoy moral, religious, and intellectual, as well as political freedom? Can we boast this highest order of independence? Or are we not, on the contrary, still the unconscious slaves of English prejudice? Are we not still the victims of her narrow-minded religious bigotry? Do we not still look up to her literature, to her philosophy, to her legislation? Have we not been tainted by the poison of her haughtiness, of her selfishness, of her bitter spirit of exclusiveness? Have we not imbibed from her much of her worse than Chinese hatred of the "outside barbarians?" In a word, are we independent of England in *mind* as well as in *body*, intellectually and morally, as well as politically?

We greatly fear that we are not. England still lords it over us, not, indeed, by her armies, by her navies, and by her iniquitous system of legislation, but by her spirit, her maxims, her

*Lester—Condition and Fate of England, vol. ii, pp. 73, 74.

† Ibid. book vii, from p. 71 to p. 157.

policy, and her prejudices, political and religious. Especially are we indebted to her for our secret, though most un-American hostility to foreigners. She has transmitted to us, as a fatal and poisoned heritage, her hereditary contempt of the French, and hatred of the Irish. We can not explain in any other way the prevalence of such a feeling among us, and that such a feeling does exist, we think no candid man will deny. We prove the fact, not merely from the recent attempt to build up a political party on this very sentiment, but from other clear and unmistakeable evidences of the popular mind. Political nativism is but an extreme and exaggerated embodiment of a spirit which lies much deeper under the surface of our national character. The native American party has turned out a complete failure; its proscriptive spirit and disgraceful doings have brought down upon it the well merited rebuke, and the withering indignation of almost the whole American people. Both the great political parties of the country have combined to set upon its forehead the burning seal of public execration. Thus far our national character has stood forth proudly erect and nobly vindicated.

But, in condemning political nativism, have we adequately rebuked the foul spirit in which it originated? Have we execrated the *thing itself*, or only its ultraism and flagitious excesses? Had not political expediency almost as much to do with the condemnation, as a sense of right and justice? Is there not still lurking, in the minds of large masses of our population, a secret jealousy, if not a positive hatred of foreigners, and especially of the Irish? Native American citizens ourselves, and justly proud of our noble country and of its glorious institutions, we would be happy could we believe that such is not the case. We would be doubly proud of our country, could we think that the views of many among our countrymen were more liberal and enlarged than sober truth proves them to be, and that our republic were really what it professes to be, the home of the exile, and the asylum of the oppressed from every nation under the sun. A liberal policy in regard to foreign immigration has contributed more, perhaps, than any other cause, to make our nation what it is. The foreigners whom this policy has attracted to our shores have not only swelled our own population, but they have greatly aided in enriching our country, and in developing its resources. They have dug our canals, cleared our forests, tilled our lands, prepared our turnpikes, and laid down our rail roads. They have done more than this. They have cheerfully enlisted in our army and navy, have gallantly fought our battles, and have perilled their lives for the country of their adoption. They have expended their labor and treasure, and have shed their blood for our benefit. They have entered into the spirit of our institutions, and have labored to become identified with us in feeling and interest. What more could we ask or expect from them?

The signs of the times do not lead us to fear any radical change in our national policy in regard to foreign immigration. But it can not be disguised that there is a growing spirit of hostility to foreigners, silently but deeply at work among our people. This is more particularly the case in regard to our Irish fellow-citizens, especially those among them who still fondly cling to the much abused religion of their forefathers. The political bigots among us hate Irishmen, merely because they are Irishmen; our religious bigots hate them because they are Catholics. Both have inherited this hatred from England. The small politicians make capital out of this feeling. On the eve of elections you find this class of men waxing wonderfully warm and sympathetic; they love Irishmen as brethren; they drop tears of compassion over the wrongs of Ireland; they are themselves Irish in feeling and heart. But the election has scarcely passed off, before their friendship has greatly cooled down or vanished entirely, or even been turned into bitter hatred and open denunciation. Thus are the Irish in America courted and kicked by turns. In the end, they get all the abuse and odium, and but little of the honors and emoluments of the political parties which divide the country.

Is this treatment generous or just? Do the Irish really deserve it? Is not the Irish character open, sincere, and generous? Are not the Irish, as a people, truthful, trustworthy, honest, and patriotic? Is there any thing peculiarly wicked or malevolent in their composition? Have they not, as a class, much less selfishness than our own population? Are

there among them more sharpers and swindlers than among our own people? Who ever heard of an Irish coward, or of an Irish traitor, in America? Who ever heard of an Irishman who, through pusillanimity, skulked from doing his duty to his adopted country? Who ever heard of an Irishman that was ungrateful to his benefactor? In our first struggle for independence, and in our late war with Great Britain, did not the Irish fight side by side with us, animating our own soldiers by their fearless bravery? Can Americans soon forget the glorious names of Montgomery and Barry, to say nothing of other illustrious Irishmen? Can they forget that the Irish were the first people in Europe to sympathize with us in our effort to secure independence, and that this generous sympathy, and the aid Irishmen subsequently afforded us, were alleged by the British court as reasons why the petitions of Ireland, for political and religious enfranchisement, should be rejected?

According to the sentiment expressed in a stanza of an old song, generosity to both friends and foes is a distinctive characteristic of Irishmen.

> "What flood reflects a shore so sweet
> As glorious Boyne or past'ral Ban;
> Or who a friend or foe can meet,
> *So generous as an Irishman?*"

The warm-hearted kindness and hospitality of the Irish are proverbial. In them the social feeling predominates over every other sentiment. Ireland is, perhaps, the only country in the world which combines the warm temperament and generous feelings of the south with the cold climate of the north. An Irish gentleman is one of the very best specimens of human nature. Elevated, chivalrous, and refined, he is also warm-hearted, ready-witted, generous, and affable. His soul is utterly incapable of one thought, or word, or action, that is mean or little. He puts you at your ease, and you feel entirely at home in his company; he forgets himself, and thinks only of those whose society he enjoys.

Faults the Irish have, but what people have not faults? But have they as many, or as glaring faults, as those who are loudest in condemning them? Let him that is without fault himself first cast a stone at his Irish brother! A portion of the poorer Irish in America have faults, some of them grievous and disgraceful; but where and from whom did many of them contract these faults? Did they not, in many cases, learn them from the degraded portion of our own native population? Did not many of them contract habits of intemperance and of its cognate vices, in consequence of the system adopted, and of the evil example set before them, on our public works? Is it generous or right, first to taint them with vice, and then to sneer at them for being vicious? Those who love to moralize, and who have superfluous zeal to expend on the amelioration of society, might find enough to do in correcting the vices of our own people "to the manor born."

We are natives ourselves, and we have had tolerably good opportunities for studying the moral character of the lower classes among our native and our Irish population, and we are of the opinion that the Irish would not at all suffer in the comparison. The mode of thinking and of judging adopted by some of our people is, indeed, singular enough. If an Irishman is seen drunk, or is heard to swear, immediately you hear sneers about the "low Irish;" but, if an American is caught in the same vicious practices, it seems to create no surprise whatever, and to be all a matter of course in this *free* country! This comes from that lurking prejudice to which we alluded above.

We believe it was the Irish orator, Sheil, who defined an Irishman, "a man who acts first and thinks afterwards." At any rate, there is some truth in the definition. But if an Irishman blunders occasionally, his blunders are of the head, never of the heart. If he have but little of the cool, calculating forecast of the Yankee, he is also exempt from many of the worst traits of character in the Yankee. He may be less shrewd and less thrifty; but he is not, for all this, the more selfish, or the less honest. Avarice is not a natural growth of the Irish soil, and of all vices in the whole catalogue, we believe there is no one which tends more to contract the heart, and to dry up the fountains of benevolence. Give us any other national vice rather than this.

We are not to be understood as implying that all, or even the more enlightened and better portion of our population, are infected with this unworthy prejudice against the Irish. Such men as Thurlow Weed, Horace Greely,

William Seward, C. Edwards Lester, and many others, are far elevated above this feeling. They take a wider and more expansive view of human nature; they soar up to regions of higher philosophy and purer philanthropy; their souls are too enlarged for any such narrow prejudice. They are Americans in the true and most comprehensive sense of the term. They appreciate excellence wherever they find it; they detest and rebuke vice, no matter what its origin. They look more to the man himself than to the *accident* which gave him birth in a particular country.

We have already dwelt long enough on this branch of the subject, and we conclude our remarks on it by a quaint quotation from that quaintest of all modern writers—Carlyle.

"The sans-potatoe Irishman is of the self-same stuff as the finest lord lieutenant! Not an individual sans-potatoe human scare-crow but had a life given to him out of heaven, with eternities depending on it: for once and no second time, with immensity in him, over him, and around him: with feelings that a Shakspeare's speech could not utter: with desires illimitable as the autocrat of all the Russias."

We can not attempt to go into any lengthy details concerning the sufferings of Ireland under English misrule. The recital would fill volumes, and it has filled some of the most eloquent volumes that ever were written.* That sad story is familiar to the most of our readers. There is not one generous heart in the civilized world which it has not touched in its tenderest chords and stirred to its very centre. Oft has the poor exile from Erin, as he wandered a stranger in some distant and uncongenial clime, sat down and wept when he remembered how the beautiful island of his birth has been marred and made desolate by the hands of the oppressor; even as the captive Israelite of old once wept on the waters of Babylon at the remembrance of the beloved Sion from which the hand of violence had rudely torn him, and whose beauties had been marred by the hand of the spoiler. It was a sad day for Ireland when the Saxon first set foot on her green and lovely soil. It was for her the beginning of all her sorrows—the great *initium malorum*. Saxon misrule, continued through long centuries, has strewn her surface with ruins and desolation, in the midst of which a poor, miserable, starving peasantry, the children of the former lords of the soil, subsist and move along, like spectres through desolate and abandoned castles. In the graphic language of Mr. Lester:

"To a distant observer that beautiful island appears like a city of ruins in the saddened light of evening. Her glory and her strength seem departed for ever. But it is not of the poetry of the past the lover of Ireland must speak. Her bards never sang in strains so mournful and pathetic as the sad lullaby of the mother over her famishing child. The complaint of poverty and the cry of suffering are more heart-breaking than her most plaintive melodies. Her woes and her dishonor move not the heart of her oppressors, but they are noted by the God of the poor."*

There is no crime, there is no enormity, which England has not committed towards Ireland. In speaking of English tyranny over the Irish people, we can not find language strong enough to paint the sober reality; exaggeration is entirely out of the question. Her treatment of Ireland both in war and peace finds no parallel in that of the most rebellious and least favored of her provinces by ancient pagan Rome, while in the heyday of her prosperity and in the full tide of her all-conquering and rapacious career. The penal code which England adopted for the government of Ireland would have disgraced the statute book of the grand Turk himself! No government, whether Christian, Mohammedan, or pagan, was ever sullied with so many crimes, or marked with so much utter baseness. Adroit diplomacy, low intrigue, base selfishness, insatiate rapacity, open treachery, high-handed spoliation and robbery, cold-blooded cruelty and persecution, and downright murder and butchery, have ever marked the policy of England towards Ireland, and exhibited to all the world the tender mercies of the English government towards its Irish subjects. O'Connell has proved all this by incontestable evidence, in his late memoir of Ireland, and in his numerous letters and speeches. The two writers whose works we are reviewing have also proved it by an appeal to the history of Ireland under English misrule during the last seven centuries. Mr. Lester shows,

* Among these the most eloquent is the late work of O'Connell: A Memoir of Ireland, Native and Saxon."

* Vol. ii, pp. 74, 75.

"By a rapid survey of the past history of Ireland, that she is an invaded and plundered nation—that her degradation and her servitude are directly chargeable on England—that British cupidity and British pride have been the alpha and omega of Irish suffering."*

The first period of Irish suffering under English oppression extends from the first invasion of Ireland by Richard Strongbow, earl of Strigal, in the year 1168, to the time of the reformation, and embraces nearly four hundred years. It is marked by a fierce border war and a protracted struggle for the ascendancy between the native Irish and the English invaders of the country. Ireland had never before worn a foreign yoke. The Roman eagles had never floated over the heads of her children. The hordes of invading Danes had been already broken and scattered by the patriotic valor of her troops. She was as free as the air of her own mountains; free as the strains of her own sweet harp. She had tasted the sweets of liberty too long to submit quietly to the English yoke.

For more than four hundred years she sustained the unequal contest with her conquerors, nor did she yield one inch of her territory without a death struggle. More than once were the Irish septs on the point of finally triumphing and expelling the English from their borders, when some unhappy division in their own ranks, or some other untoward event, suddenly inclined the scale of victory in favor of England. But though overcome by superior force and tactics, yet did she never consent willingly to wear the fetters with which she was bound. Though down-trodden and a captive, her spirit was not broken: and she still fondly cherished visions of freedom. And she still as fondly clings to those same visions: alas that they should be even yet but visions! To the honor of Ireland be it said that, though conquered, she has never yet licked the feet of her conquerors, nor kissed the chains with which she was trammelled!

Had England pursued a different and more liberal policy in regard to Ireland, this protracted war between the two races might have been much sooner terminated by the fusion of the two into one people. This is admitted by the latest English Protestant historian of Ireland—Dr. Smiles of Leeds. We must present an extract from the preface to his work, as it confirms what we have said and throws additional light on the period of which we are speaking.

"In England and Scotland the conquering and the conquered races—Danes, Normans, Saxons, Britons, &c.—have, in a great measure, fused down into one people; but in Ireland the two races of the conquest are still at war, and after a resistance which has lasted for centuries, the struggle is almost as inveterate now as at the period of its commencement. The blame of this protracted and destructive enmity between race and race *rests with the conquering classes themselves*, as well as with the English government, which has supported them throughout in their *anti-national* and *inhuman policy*. Instead of amalgamating themselves with the nation, the Norman invaders, and afterwards the English and Scotch colonists who settled in Ireland, erected themselves into an ascendancy of the despotic and tyrannical kind. In course of time they possessed themselves of almost the entire soil of Ireland, treating the natives as helots and slaves, and *with a cruelty which has never been exceeded in any age or country*. Laws were passed for the express purpose of keeping the nation distinct from the settlers, and thus preventing them from merging into one people. 'Mere Irish' were deprived of the protection of the English law, *and might be killed with impunity*. Statutes were passed expressly to prevent the English settlers from conforming to Irish language, dress, and manners, on pain of forfeiture of goods, and imprisonment, and being dealt with as '*Irish enemies*.' And thus were the Irish people placed under the ban of proscription and exclusion by their conquerors, and a mark set on them to be shunned and hated by their fellow men."*

From the unexceptionable testimony of this candid English historian we gather, that the Irish were branded with infamy by the English and declared aliens and *enemies* in the heart of their own country! This term *enemies* was, we believe, first employed in a statute passed under Henry IV; and it is the only article of English law, as Moore the poet well remarks, to which the English have remained constantly faithful! More than once had the native Irish petitioned to be admitted to the rights of English citizenship; but their petitions were treated

* Ibid. p. 75.

* Quoted in a late number of the Irish "Nation."

with scorn and contempt. They might be the *slaves*, they could not hope to become the *subjects* of England! This would place them under the protection of English law, and would prevent the English lords of the pale from robbing them with impunity.

Goaded to desperation by these and similar acts of tyranny, the Irish septs often flew to arms; but each formidable insurrection was put down by an overwhelming royal army, which nearly always followed up the victory by wholesale massacre and spoliation.

"At every insurrection came new troops of English adventurers who were in need of lands; and every poor and ruined nobleman sought to repair his fortunes in a country where murder and pillage gave a right to property."*

Outlawed in their own country, and hunted down by their enemies after having been despoiled of their property, did the native Irish seek to fly from their homes and eke out a subsistence in some more genial abode on the continent; even this mode of escape was precluded by the inhuman English law which forbade "the *Irish enemies to leave the country.*"† But, more and still worse than all this, a mark was set on these same *Irish enemies*, that any one, who was base and cruel enough to perpetrate the atrocious crime, might murder them with impunity wherever they might be found!! For this unheard of and almost incredible wantonness of cruelty, we have the authority of the English statute book itself, and the express testimony of an unexceptionable Scotch Protestant historian—Sir James Macintosh. He says:

"During the dreadful period of four hundred years, the laws of the English government of Ireland did not punish the murder of *one man of Irish blood as a crime.*"‡

We verily believe that the history of no nation on earth is stained with cruelty so wanton or more refined than this; and we subscribe to Mr. Lester's opinion that "none but an English despot has the skill to carry the refinement of tyranny so far."§

The leading maxim of English policy in her government of Ireland, as well as the true secret of her success in retaining her hold on that ill-fated country, was: *divide et impera*—divide and rule. By intrigues and bribery she set chieftain against chieftain and sept against sept; she carfully kept alive the old feuds which had ever been the bane of Irish prosperity, and she thus brought about "the estrangement of those who should have stood shoulder to shoulder in the strife for common freedom. . . . . This has been her policy from first to last; and its successful application is all that prevents Ireland from taking her place among the nations of the earth."*

But sad and mournful as is the epoch of Irish history of which we have hitherto spoken; heart-rending and sickening as are its details, that period at which we must now rapidly glance is yet more afflicting, and is filled with still greater enormities. This might seem impossible, but it is even so. From the reformation, *so called*, down to the present time, a new and more exciting element has been infused into the political hatred which England had ever borne to Ireland. This new and most bitter ingredient in the chalice of Irish suffering was a fierce and relentless religious bigotry. England had crushed the *bodies*, she now meant to bow down or crush the *souls* of Irishmen! If English misrule was a curse to Ireland, English Protestant bigotry was a curse a hundred-fold greater and heavier and more appalling in its consequences.

When England was violently severed from Catholic unity by the headlong passions and high-handed tyranny of Henry VIII, she sought to drag Ireland also into her schism and apostacy. The truculent and bloody tyrant who had made himself head of the Anglican church, spared no efforts to induce Ireland to acknowledge his spiritual supremacy. Bribes and menaces, the sword and the bayonet, the rack and the gibbet, were successively employed for this purpose. But they were all unavailing. The great body of the Irish people still fondly clung to the faith of their forefathers which had consoled and strengthened them in the midst of sufferings that had rarely, if ever, fallen to the lot of any other nation. They might be despoiled of their property, they might be branded as aliens and outlaws in the heart of their own dear country, they might suffer the death of traitors, or they might be massacred in cold blood; but no in-

* Regnault—"Criminal history of the English government," p. 13. † See ibid.
‡ Quoted by Lester: "Fate and Condition of England, ii, p. 71. § Ibid. p. 80.

* Ibid. p. 81.

dignity nor suffering could tear from their hearts the bright jewel of faith which they so highly prized and so dearly cherished. They might lose all else, but they would still warmly press this treasure to their bosoms! England had never yet offered them one single blessing which was not more than outweighed by its attending curse; and could they now be induced to receive the reformation as a boon from *her* treacherous and blood-stained hands? No, no; Ireland would not apostatize.

This stern refusal to abandon the Catholic faith and to subscribe to the new-fangled and ever changing religious notions of England, constituted Ireland's greatest crime. No language can adequately portray the refinements of cruelty by which this crime has been visited by England for nearly three centuries. In the poignant bitterness of her sufferings during this period, the Irish Catholic almost forgot the many atrocities perpetrated in his country by the English during the first four centuries of their domination. The annals of no country in the wide world, whether Christian or pagan, can present any thing half so cruel or atrocious, as that which is unfolded in the persecutions of the Irish Catholics by the English government since the period of the reformation. The facts almost stagger belief; and the recital makes our very blood freeze in our veins! This is admitted by Dr. Smiles, the candid English Protestant, to whose recent history of Ireland we have already referred. He says:

"The records of religious persecutions in all countries have nothing more hideous to offer to our notice than the Protestant persecutions of the Irish Catholics. On them all the devices of cruelty were exhausted. Ingenuity was taxed to devise new plans of persecution, till the machinery of penal iniquity might almost be pronounced perfect."*

What are we to think of a penal code which forbade Catholics to open schools for the education of their children; which set a price upon the heads of Irish priests, and hunted them down like wild beasts; which double taxed, ground down with unheard of extortions, and openly despoiled the Catholics of their property; which authorized the apostate son to drive his grey-headed father from the paternal roof, if he refused to turn Protestant in his old age; and which relentlessly pursued religious non-conformity with fines and imprisonment, with fire and sword? What are we to think of a policy which necessarily induced ignorance and poverty, and then sneered at both? What are we to think of a system of legislation which forbade a Catholic to own a horse worth more than five pounds, and authorized his Protestant neighbor to rob him of it *by law*, if he could prove before a justice of the peace that he had tendered five pounds for the animal and been refused! What are we in a word to think of a government which adopted the systematic policy of first driving the Irish Catholics into revolt by intolerable exactions and cruelties, and then despoiled them of their property, and butchered them in thousands!!

Yet this was precisely the policy which Protestant England pursued towards Catholic Ireland for centuries! And this explains to us the anomalous and otherwise unaccountable fact that, whereas seven-eighths of the Irish people are still Catholics, more than *three-fourths* of the entire landed property of the island is now in the hands of Protestants. The great Irish Catholic chieftains and landlords were purposely goaded into rebellion that they might be branded as traitors, and their lands confiscated for the benefit of English adventurers. Such was the course adopted towards Earl Desmond, a powerful chief of Munster; such also was the treatment of O'Neill another wealthy and valorous Irish chieftain. When Queen Elizabeth heard of the revolt of the latter, she remarked to her courtiers, with a fiendish smile: "*it would be better for her servants, as there would be estates enough for them all.*"

"This single expression of Elizabeth," says Mr. Lester, "reveals the entire policy of the English government towards Ireland. That injured country was the great repast at which every monarch bade his lords sit down and eat. After they had gorged their fill, the remains were left for those who should come after. Tranquillity succeeded these massacres, but it was the tranquillity of the grave-yard. The proud and patriotic Irishmen were folded in the sleep of death, and the silence and repose around the lifeless corpses were called *peace*.

'They made a solitude,
And called it peace.'"*

* Preface to his History of Ireland.

* Vol. ii, pp. 83, 84.

We must give another fine extract from this author on the same subject.

"Often a great chief, possessed of large estates, was purposely driven by the most flagrant injustice and insults into open rebellion, that he might be branded as a traitor, and his rich possessions by confiscation revert to the English vampyres that so infested the land. Every cruelty and outrage that can dishonor our nature, was perpetrated in those unjust wars by English leaders and English soldiers. Cities were sacked, villages burned, women violated, and the helpless and the young slaughtered by thousands. A record of these scenes of crime and blood we can not furnish. It is written, however, on every foot of Irish soil, and in the still living memories of many an Irish heart."*

To exhibit the tender mercies of the English armies when they had succeeded in putting down a rebellion which the persecuting and iniquitous policy of the English government had provoked, we may present the testimony of two cotemporary English writers, Hollingshead and the poet Spenser, concerning the desolation which reigned in the province of Munster after the defeat of Earl Desmond.

"This province," says Hollingshead, "which was heretofore rich, very populous and fertile, covered with green pastures, crops, and herds of cattle, is now deserted and barren; it bears no fruit; there is no grain in the fields, no cattle in the pastures, no birds in the trees, no fish in the rivers; in short, the curse of heaven (!) on this country is so great that you may pass through from one extremity to the other, and you rarely see a man, woman, or child."†

The poet Spenser, who received three thousand acres of land from the confiscated estates of Desmond in compensation for his fulsome flattery of royalty, thus describes the scene which he witnessed on going to take possession of his estate in Ireland.

"Out of every corner of the woods and glynnes they (the people) came creeping forth upon their hands, for their legs could not bear them. They looked like anatomies of death—they spake like ghosts crying out of their graves—they ate the dead carrion, happy when they could find them; yea, *and one another soon after;* insomuch as the very carcasses they spared not to scrape out of their graves; and if they found a plat of water-cresses, or shamrocks, to those they flocked as to a feast for the time, yet not able to continue there withal, that in a short space there were none almost left, and a most populous and plentiful country was suddenly left void of man and beast."*

These are but single pages in the long and sad history of Ireland's wrongs under English oppression. They are, however, pretty fair specimens of the whole work. England's policy towards Ireland has been very simple, steady, and uniform; and its practical effects on Ireland and the Irish people have been nearly the same for the last seven centuries. For almost two centuries immediately succeeding the reformation, the history of Ireland is a monotonous recital of tragedies and sickening horrors such as those just described. The same means were employed in each successive reign, and the same dreadful effects followed. After having filled Ireland with desolation and massacre; after having cut off most of its heroes, murdered most of its chiefs, and sent her vampyres to seize on its richest lands, Elizabeth had a medal struck which bore the inscription—*pacata Hibernia!* But Ireland was exhausted, not conquered; trodden in the dust, not *pacified.* And England may yet learn that brute force is not the most appropriate or adequate means for *pacifying* a people feeling keenly their wrongs and resolved to be free! If she has not learned this lesson already, she may yet soon learn it to her sorrow.

Ireland was destined to become the victim and the prey of each succeeding English dynasty. The Stuarts carried out the fiendish policy of the Tudors. They even added blackhearted ingratitude and treachery to open spoliation. Noble and generous Ireland poured out her blood in torrents for the two Charleses, and they betrayed her with a Judas-like kiss. Ireland fought bravely for the last and best of the Stuarts, James II, and he, far from sympathizing with her in her devoted love, could only cry out in the memorable battle of the Boyne, when Irish valor was repulsing the English and their Dutch allies: "Spare, oh! spare my *English* subjects!"

From the accession of the house of Stuart to its expulsion from the English throne—a period of more than eighty years, including

* Ibid. p. 82.
† Quoted by Regnault, pp. 15, 16.

* State of Ireland—quoted by Lester, vol. ii, p. 92.

the times of Cromwell and the commonwealth—Ireland was almost continually torn with dissensions and civil wars, pillaged by succeeding armies, and stained with the blood of her slaughtered children. Besides her own hereditary miseries, she was doomed to share in all the evils consequent on each political revulsion of the sister kingdom. Her fidelity to the Stuarts brought down on her devoted head the terrible vengeance of Cromwell, whose fanatical armies swept over her fair soil like a swarm of Huns spreading devastation every where, butchering the inhabitants in cold blood, and leaving only ruin, desolation, and the voice of wailing behind them. The terrible doings of these merciless ruffians who wore long faces, quoted the Bible, and uttered long prayers, in the very same breath that they massacred the helpless widow and orphan, and imbrued their hands in the blood of the "papists," are still freshly remembered in Ireland; and the most withering malediction which an Irishman can utter, is that which invokes the "curse of Cromwell" on his enemy!

All who have read the history of Ireland will know that we have not exaggerated in the sketch just drawn, and that we have not done injustice to the unfortunate house of Stuart. The contemptible and pedantic James I, the first of that house who sat on the English throne, was the first English monarch who carried out the system of Irish spoliation on an extended scale, and by the chicanery of law; at a time too of profound peace, and without any provocation whatever! At the commencement of his reign, the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel were declared, without a shadow of proof, to be agents in a grand Catholic conspiracy against English Protestant ascendancy in Ireland. Their vast property, extending through six counties, and embracing five hundred thousand acres of land, was declared confiscated to the crown, and the base robbery was sanctioned by a subservient Irish parliament to which James had caused creatures of his own to be returned. But this was not enough to satisfy the insatiate rapacity of the English monarch. We will give the energetic language of Mr. Lester on the subject.

"His success in this king's robbery only whetted his appetite for greater spoils. But what new scheme could he devise by which to wrest from the Irish chieftains their estates, for even a *villian's* brain will become exhausted of plots. A commission was appointed '*for the discovery of defective titles.*' A set of men called discoverers was employed to hunt up defects in the titles of landholders, who, of course, were rewarded in proportion to their success, or, in other words, a premium was given to the best informer. It was not difficult to find defective titles in a land that had for centuries been afloat in the turbulent waves of civil war, especially when witnesses were suborned for the purpose, and bribes and violence and tortures freely employed to wring the Irish estates from their lawful owners."*

We might fill a volume with atrocities like these; but we sicken at details so revolting; and we must hasten on. To the everlasting honor of Catholic Ireland be it said, that, though thus ruthlessly persecuted and trampled under foot by Protestant England, yet was *she* never stained with the crime of religious persecution! At three different periods of her history, Catholic Ireland regained for a short time the political ascendancy; and she might then have repaid her spoilers and persecutors in their own coin. During the reign of Mary, at the close of that of Charles I, and at the time of the revolution that expelled James II from the English throne, the Catholics of Ireland might have driven the English Protestants from the island: but they made no attempt of the kind—they shed not one drop of Protestant blood in the hallowed name of religion! Let the bigots who are for ever denouncing the Catholic church for her persecuting spirit, and sneering at the "low and blood-thirsty Irish," remember this unquestionable fact, and blush—if they have not wholly lost the power of blushing! Generous and noble-hearted by nature, the Irish Catholics at the first dawn of national prosperity forgot the dark clouds which had so long hung over, and the terrible storms that had so often swept through their devoted country; they forgave all past injuries, insults, and atrocities; and they nobly requited evil with good, curses with blessings. The sun did not set on their anger!

What return England made for this generous forgiveness we have already seen. But there is yet one bitter cup which she put to the lips of Ireland, to which we have not yet alluded. Not content with all her previous

* Vol. ii, p. 88.

outrages, she let loose on Ireland a set of ruthless and truculent blood-hounds, who thirsted for her blood and rioted amidst her ruin and desolation. The Irish Orangemen were sworn to maintain the Protestant ascendancy in Ireland, and, if need was, to wade up to their knees in Irish Catholic blood! For more than a century the whole power of England sustained this blood-thirsty faction; and the English government withdrew its support only when the indignant outcry of the civilized world, seconding that of bleeding Ireland, compelled it to do so! The Orangemen were but the executioners of that iniquitous system which England had ever pursued towards Ireland—of that fiendish policy which set Irishmen against Irishmen, scattered spies and informers over the land, and liberally rewarded every act of baseness and treachery! And a burning shame it is, that she always found Irishmen base enough to take the wages of iniquity, and meanly to sell their country's birthright for a mess of pottage! Division among Irishmen has ever been the greatest bane of that beautiful but devoted island.

Space fails us to speak of the noble exertions made by the men of 1782 for the regeneration of Ireland; of the brilliant but, alas! ephemeral success which crowned their efforts; of the victories achieved by the noble eloquence of Grattan; of the memorable "rebellion" of 1798, and of the dreadful consequences which ensued from it to Ireland. All these things are familiar to our readers. There is not an intelligent Irishman in the wide world whose soul has not been stirred in its deepest fountains by the familiar details of those glorious or terrible events. Throughout this whole period of Ireland's history, the English government continued to pursue its usual selfish and treacherous policy. If the demands of the Irish volunteers were granted, it was with an ill grace, and only because England, exhausted by war and terrified by the recent successful revolt of her American colonies, could not do otherwise than grant them. But so soon as she recovered from her temporary difficulties, she retrieved the *faux pas* she had made in her most approved style. She goaded the Irish into rebellion, then crushed them by brute force; and, while Ireland lay crushed and bleeding at every pore, she annihilated her national parliament by the odious "act of union."

This master-stroke of Pitt's policy "was conceived in iniquity and brought forth in sin." It was the death-blow of Irish independence and nationality. It laid Ireland prostrate at the feet of England. It permanently fastened the odious English ascendancy on the necks of Irishmen. It marred the prosperity, crippled the commerce, ruined the manufactures, weakened the energies, and crushed the spirit of Ireland. It did more. It firmly established and greatly increased that detestable system of absenteeism which annually drained Ireland of millions of her treasure to be expended in England or on the continent. It bound Ireland hand and foot, and placed her wholly at the mercy of an overwhelming majority in the English parliament. Against the solemn faith plighted by England in the act of the union itself, it saddled on Ireland the enormous public debt of England. In a word, it enriched England at the expense of Ireland, and it overspread the latter country with pauperism and misery unutterable. The bill of Catholic emancipation, reluctantly passed by the English parliament in 1829, mitigated somewhat, but did not remove, these crying evils. They still exist to an alarming extent and in an ever-increasing magnitude. England still has her foot on the bosom of prostrate Ireland, and English iron still enters the soul and pierces the very vitals of Irishmen!

It is not necessary to accumulate evidence to establish all these familiar and well known facts; nor can we pause to give details showing the present impoverishment and starving condition of vast masses of the Irish people, under the operation of the heartless English policy of which we have endeavored to present the leading features. Mr. Lester has spread out all this evidence before the American community. He has proved the dreadful condition of Ireland from the official report of the poor law commissioners appointed by the English government to inquire into the condition of the Irish laboring classes, and made up of evidence taken on the spot.* We can do nothing more at present than merely refer to the arguments which he presents on the subject, and to the unanswerable speeches of O'Connell. We can find room for but one eloquent extract from Mr. Lester's work, on the manner in which the infamous "act of union" was passed in 1800.

* Vol. ii, p. 132 seqq.

"But, with all her fair pretensions, England could not have carried the union without the presence of her immense military force. What could Ireland do? Prostrate from a sanguinary struggle, laid under martial law, the *habeas corpus* act suspended, no protection to property, liberty or life; the jails crowded with innocent victims; the scaffolds red with the blood of those who had committed no crime; tortures and death on every side: what could she do? How could she discuss the union calmly with more than a hundred thousand bayonets bristling around her, and pointing at her heart? . . . To this fear of physical force were added bribes and corruption. Rotten boroughs were bought up, that those favorable to the English interest might be returned to the legislature. Lord Castlereagh declared in the house of commons that 'he would carry the union though it might cost more than half a million in bribes.' The price of a single vote on the question was eight thousands pounds, or nearly forty thousand dollars, or, in its place, an appointment worth ten thousand dollars per annum. More than six millions of dollars were spent in buying up close rotten boroughs, seven millions more in bribes, making in all, in round numbers, *fourteen millions of dollars*, distributed to effect the subjugation of Ireland. Yet with her one hundred and seventy thousand bayonets, and fourteen millions of dollars, there were seven hundred and seven thousand who petitioned *against* the union, and only five thousand *for* it."*

To *repeal* this atrocious act of union, passed in this iniquitous manner, and riveting so strongly the chains of Irish bondage, is the great object of Ireland's present mighty struggle. This it is that has set Ireland in motion from one extremity to the other. This it is which lately called together the "monster" meetings which enkindled the wrath of England, and revived the drooping spirits of Ireland. This it is which is the true secret of the present Irish agitation. That agitation is peaceful, but it is mighty. It is inspired by a deep sense of insufferable wrongs, and of sufferings keenly *felt* by almost† the entire Irish population. It is the peaceful, sober cry of Ireland for *liberty*, and for a redress of grievances no longer to be endured. It is founded on truth and justice, and it will, it *must* be successful.

Ireland deserves to be free. By her great moral regeneration under the happy influence of Father Mathew's great temperance movement, and by having abstained from all violence and crime during the progress of an excitement unparalleled in her history, she has proved to all the world that she is capable of freedom and of self-government.

And why should she not be free? Beats there a heart in a generous, in an *American* bosom which sympathizes not with her in her wrongs, and raises not the impassioned cry of *freedom* in her behalf? Will it be said that the cry of Greece, of Poland, and even of Texas, for sympathy and succor, found a hearty response in the bosoms of our countrymen, but that the cry of suffering and bleeding Ireland—of Ireland which has been the victim of more enormous oppressions than ever fell to the lot of all other oppressed nations put together—will sound on our ears without making any impression on our hearts, merely because Ireland is Catholic and England Protestant? Reverse the case; make England Catholic and Ireland Protestant, and a flame of indignation would blaze from one end of this union to the other. All who would not sympathize with Protestant Ireland oppressed by Catholic England, would be branded as enemies of freedom, and as unworthy of the American name. Can any one doubt this for a moment? But are not justice and truth the same, as the case now stands; and will not every liberal mind agree that Ireland deserves to be free, no matter what her religion, or what that of her oppressor?

Yes: say what we will, do what we will, whether we aid Ireland or not, she will yet be free! All that is necessary to secure her freedom is union, patience, and perseverance. She has a leader just such as the emergency demands. She has a leader whose courage and genius, in the face and in spite of England, have thrown open the iron portals of the British parliament to the Irish, English, and Scotch Catholics. She has a leader who is as calm and collected as he is bold and untiring; as talented as he is eloquent; as great in the legislature as he is on the rostrum. She has a leader who has done what never an Irish Catholic did before; escaped triumphantly from the toils and chicanery of the English law, *as administered in Ireland;* quashed the "monster" indictment; broken the bars of the prison to which English injustice had consigned him, and achieved a bloodless *legal* victory over

* Ibid. pp. 105, 106.

† Sad is it that we are compelled to write *almost*. With Cicero we may exclaim: utinam illud *pene* tolleretur!

England according to the unwilling verdict of England herself! This greatest man of the age, this modern Demosthenes, this Hercules of peace, must and will triumph!

Yes: the martyred Emmett's epitaph will yet be written! And if any one can write it, it must be DANIEL O'CONNELL!

"Emmett said, '*till Ireland be free, let not my epitaph be written;*' and it shall not be. He offered himself up as a holocaust of liberty. He shouted one battle-cry in the ears of his countrymen, and died. They err much who supposed he accomplished nothing. A martyr never dies in vain. Every drop of his blood will yet send forth a living man fraught with the fire of his origin. The name of Emmett at this day stirs every patriot heart in that green isle like the blast of a trumpet. His dying words are remembered and repeated to every generation. He bequeathed his free spirit to his country in sacred trust, looking forward to that day when his emancipated country should write his epitaph and honor his sacrifice. The flag of freedom shall yet wave over her ashes, and the shout of a ransomed people shake the earth that encloses him."*

Daniel O'Connell will yet, we fervently hope, cause that flag of freedom to wave in triumph over the tomb of Emmett! He must fulfil his own mission, as thus beautifully unfolded by himself: "Grattan declared he had watched at the cradle of Ireland and followed her hearse. He is reckoned among the illustrious dead. I LIVE TO SOUND THE TRUMPET OF HER RESURRECTION."†

* Lester vol. ii, pp. 111, 112.
† Letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury.

ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS.

1. *The validity of Anglican Ordinations examined.* By the Very Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick, V. G. Philadelphia, 1841.
2. *Essays to prove the validity of Anglican Ordinations.* By a Layman. Baltimore, 1844.

WHEN the British parliament resolved on suppressing ten of the episcopal sees of the established church of Ireland, the hearts of some English churchmen were panic-stricken, lest the storm which suddenly overthrew so many ancient fabrics of the sister island should soon visit their own shores. In the contingency of the support of the state being withdrawn from their church establishment, they deemed it necessary to point to a higher source of their ministerial powers, and accordingly they descanted on the apostolic succession, and affected to disregard every other title to popular confidence. Order was restored to the rank of a sacrament, and the formularies which excluded it were explained away, as meaning no more than that it was not such a sacrament as baptism, or the Lord's supper; and the imposition of hands was said to convey grace, or at least to be attended by its communication. The question concerning the validity of Anglican orders was naturally revived under those circumstances, although the Oxford writers did not betray any hesitation on that point, whilst, to meet one of the most imposing difficulties that beset it, they advanced the novel principle that the power and grace of orders were communicated by the imposition of hands, without any form of words whatever. It can not be doubted that the admission by Dr. Lingard of the authenticity of the Lambeth register, and consequently of the fact that Parker had been ordained by Barlow and others, to fill the see of Canterbury under Elizabeth, favored their pretensions: for, although that eminent historian, to maintain the neutrality of his position, studiously avoided the expression of any opinion on the validity of the ordination, yet the fact was industriously confounded with the theological controversy, and, on both sides of the Atlantic, peals of triumph rang, as if an eminent Catholic divine had acknowledged the validity of the Anglican orders! We are not of those who envy others the pleasures of imagination.

The vicar-general of the neighboring dio-

cess, who has since been raised to the see of St. Louis, ventured to remind his Episcopalian friends of the broad distinction between the concession of Dr. Lingard and the main controversy which regards the validity of the form prescribed in the ordinal of Edward VI, and, what was somewhat bolder, he respectfully questioned the conclusion at which the eminent historian had arrived regarding the fact itself; but he took care to shield himself under the name of Dr. Milner, who had rejected the evidence as unsatisfactory. We dislike man-worship, and deprecate blind assent to the opinions and views of individuals, however eminent: yet we are slow to countenance attacks on a deliberate judgment formed with all the facilities for correct inquiry. The perusal of Dr. Kenrick's work has convinced us that the fact is beset with perplexing difficulties: but we choose to assume it on the authority of the historian, and so narrow the controversy to the theological point.

It is somewhat remarkable that the defence of the Anglican ordinations should have been undertaken by a layman, who, at the end of the preface to his essays, lays aside the *incognito*, and reveals himself as Hugh Davey Evans, a member of our bar. The silence of the Episcopalian clergy during three years did not surprise us, as we thought it wise on their part to pass unheeded the attack on their titles, whilst their flocks were unmoved by it: but for a time we were led to hope that a young divine of Philadelphia would enter the lists, as he promply promised on the first appearance of Dr. Kenrick's work. Several of the points mooted were, however, such as might well fall within the proper objects of legal research and judgment, and, in this respect, Mr. Evans has showed his professional knowledge and tact: but the main question is theological, and the maxim, *ne sutor ultra crepidam*, let every one confine himself to his profession, is seldom disregarded without some mishap. True, Mr. Evans has pleaded well, and may claim the merit of a defence as able as the case might admit; yet some errors against sound theology here and there occur, which we know not whether to ascribe to his inexperience in polemics, or to the deficiency of the system in which he has been trained. On the whole, we must award praise to the skill of the advocate, and even to his temper. His apology, lame as it is for the affected use of the appellation, "Mr. Kenrick," will doubtless be readily accepted by the bishop; but for our part we protest loudly against the use of the nicknames "Romish and Romanist" which constantly disfigure his reply—terms which every consideration of courtesy and decorum should banish from the republic of letters.

The difficulty of reconciling, one with the other, the various state documents collected by Rymer, on the matters in question, led Dr. Kenrick to seek for some criterion to distinguish genuine from supposititious commissions, or writs, and he adopted the opinion of some preceding writer, who took as genuine all such as were marked: *Per Breve de sigillo privato*; or, *Per ipsam Reginam*; as having been issued in virtue of writs under the privy seal, or great seal; and rejected others not thus authenticated. Mr. Evans sports with these marks of authenticity; and quotes Blackstone for the instruction of his readers, although we have not been able to discover in his words any thing to take away the force of the distinction. However, we attach little importance to it, and would willingly have learned from Mr. Evans any other means of distinguishing true from false documents; in default whereof we would have hoped for some means of reconciling the contradictions which the documents exhibit: *Concordantia discordantium canonum.* Parker, in a writ of 20th October, is styled archbishop of Canterbury; yet a writ issues on 6th of December directing his consecration.

It does not appear to us worth the labor to dispute the fact alledged in the Lambeth register. It matters little in our opinion whether Parker was unceremoniously declared a bishop in a hotel at a convivial meeting, or formally ordained in the manner there stated, in a chapel carpeted and decorated as the register describes. We are willing to grant that at the hour of five or six o'clock in the morning, as is there affirmed, although rather an early hour in December, and not a usual hour for so solemn a function, Parker was ordained by Barlow, assisted by Scorey, Coverdale, and Hodgkins. The circumstantiality of the account which confirms Mr. Evans in its belief, would lead us to suspect its correctness, as the style is unusual; but we renounce all our scruples, overpowered by the authority of Dr. Lingard. On the ordination of Barlow we are not alto-

gether satisfied, although the presumptions are no doubt strong, but counterbalanced by circumstances of no inconsiderable weight. We leave, however, Dr. Kenrick and Mr. Evans to settle the matter, by Starkie's rules of evidence, or in whatever other way they please; and we grant that Barlow was ordained according to the rite prescribed in the Roman pontifical, *probably* in the country, as the defender of his ordination quoted by Courayer conjectures, but certainly some where, either as bishop of St. Asaph, or of St. David's, or of Bath and Wells. We grant, for argument's sake, or rather to avoid a superfluous and perplexing discussion, that Barlow was a true bishop, and that he performed the rite described in the record. Before, however, we acknowledge the apostolical succession of the Anglican ministry, we beg the solution of one difficulty which haunts our minds. It is admitted that a bishop can not ordain another bishop unless by some rite expressive of the communication of the episcopal character. The imposition of hands is known from the Scriptures to be the rite: but it is generally agreed that words should be employed determining this act to this special end. We ask then: were the words employed in the ordination of Parker sufficiently expressive of episcopal power and authority? If they were not, we apprehend the rite was ineffectual and vain.

Mr. Evans will probably banter us, after the fashion wherein he deals with Dr. Kenrick, as to our inability to determine the form of ordination. To avoid obscurity or ambiguity, we have abstained from this word. Christ not having prescribed a special formulary to be used on this occasion, we look on it as the province of the church to determine the words to be used, and we regard the whole ritual sanctioned by immemorial usage as a matter to be scrupulously observed. Although we may not take on us to determine what portion of it is sufficient for the validity of ordination; we can say without hesitation that Christ did not leave to queens, or kings, or parliaments, the choice or determination of rites or words to be used in conveying the powers of his ministry; and we, therefore, presume that any rite or formulary introduced and established by the civil power is nugatory for the end of spiritual grace. It is manifest that the ordinal of Edward VI, by whomsoever prepared, derived its sanction and authority from the parliament and crown, and, although it had not received a formal and distinct confirmation from Elizabeth or her parliament, it was employed not by ecclesiastical, but by royal authority, supposed and implied.

The words used in the imposition of hands, according to the ordinal of Edward VI, were these: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is already* in thee, by imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of soberness." These express nothing peculiar to the episcopate, and seem to regard a grace already received: "Quæ jam per impositionem manuum in te est." Mr. Evans, after Courayer, endeavors to supply this deficiency by showing that the prayer used on the occasion mentions the office of bishop; but this, even in its present form, which, we presume, has been amended, does not express either the power or grace of episcopacy. Courayer gives it in these terms: "Almightie God, gever of all good thinges, whiche by thy Holy Spirite hast appoineted diverse orders of ministers in thy churche, mercifully beholde thys thy servant nowe called to the work and ministry of a bishop, and replenish him so with the truthe of thy doctrine and innocencie of life, that both by worde and dede he maie faithfully serve the in thys office,"† etc. We can see nothing in this prayer to determine the episcopal character, and if the rest of the ceremonial be regarded in connection with the avowed principles of the actors, and of the times, we feel bound to consider the whole rite as constituting an officer of the crown, rather than a successor of the apostles. If Mr. Evans would effectually vindicate Anglican orders, he should show that the rite employed was of itself fully expressive of the character and power of a Christian bishop. If it was otherwise, the use of the term bishop could not avail, because the term itself is vague, and originally of profane application, and rendered once more profane by the notion of the representative and delegated capacity in which the bishop appeared as the creature of the crown under Henry VIII and Edward VI, and under Eliza-

*This word is omitted in the English version, but corresponds to *jam* in the original Latin.

†Page 101. Evans, p. 220.

beth. This we apprehend to be the fair issue, which must prove fatal to the Anglican pretensions.

Mr. Evans makes an extraordinary remark, which, as it contains a theological paradox, we can not pass unnoticed. "In truth," he says,* "the consecration of Barlow is utterly unimportant, as he was not the sole, or even principal consecrator of Parker, who was consecrated equally by all four of the prelates present." This observation he borrows from Mr. Haddan, who urges it in these terms: "The position occupied by Barlow does not answer to that of the consecrating bishop (as he is termed), who was usually either the metropolitan himself, or one commissioned by him; for the latter (according to the canon of the fourth council of Carthage, and according to our ordinal, both King Edward's and the present form) pronounces the words of consecration alone, the 'assistant' bishops joining in the imposition of hands (in the words, however, also, according to the Roman ordinal, although in a lower tone),—whereas here, in consecrating the metropolitan himself, all joined throughout and equally. It follows, then, upon every theory, that the absence of Barlow's consecration, if it were so, would not invalidate that of Parker." This, truly, is a new view of the case. Parker was not ordained according to the prescriptions of the ordinal of Edward, or of any church ordinal; there was no consecrating prelate; but, contrary to all precedent, the four prelates concurred equally in the whole ceremonial. If the rite were strictly ecclesiastical, and contained substantially the expression of episcopal power, the concurrence of all in each part might not vitiate it,—utile non debet per inutile vitiari,—and the fact of one among them possessing the episcopal character might serve to establish its validity; but in the case in question the rite was not ecclesiastical, and did not express the communication of episcopal power; wherefore their concurrence served only to destroy the appearance of conformity to the ordinal, to which it was professedly similar. The validity of consecrations by one bishop† will not help the case, as we shall presently see.

The apostate, Marc Antonio de Dominis, and some others, whose episcopal character is certain, assisted at the ordination of Anglican bishops, and imposed hands conformably to the prescription of the ordinal of Edward VI. This, Mr. Evans contends, must have given the episcopate, even should the principal celebrant be thought destitute of the character of bishop. Sound principles of theology compel us to dissent from this position, since, if the principal fail, his assistants, being secondary, can not produce the effect. This is plain in reference to such as followed the ordinal of Edward, which prescribes no words to be used by the assistants, and is true even of the Roman rite, in which the assistants perform only a ceremonial office. Mr. Evans agrees with Dr. Kenrick in regarding as merely ceremonial the words, Receive the Holy Ghost.

It is no trifling prejudice against the validity of Anglican orders, whatever be the cause of calling them in question, that they were denied by Catholic divines generally, even during the reign of Elizabeth, as Mr. Evans does not dissemble;* and no account was had of them in the reign of Mary, and the constant practice of the church has been to ordain converts from the Anglican ministry, as if they never had received orders. Mr. Evans denies that the decree of Clement XI, in 1704, made with the advice of the inquisition, can be taken as a final decision of this controversy, and maintains that it was grounded on an erroneous statement of facts. We do not pretend that it has been formally decided, but the decree and usage are no equivocal indications of the judgment of the highest authorities of the church. The Anglican ordinations would surely be respected equally as those of the Greeks, if they were not plainly invalid. The English convocation, in 1662, virtually acknowledged the vagueness of the form used for above a century, by amending it. Mr. Evans ingeniously insists that this would not have been done, if it was thought to imply such a concession;† but he forgets that in endeavoring to extricate themselves from a difficulty, persons sometimes entangle themselves more seriously.

The attempt to make Cardinal Pole and Paul IV approvers of Anglican ordinations can scarcely be serious. The indulgence shown

* Page 17. † P. 197.

* P. 131. † P. 216.

to such as abjured heresy secured to them the livings which they occupied; but the condition laid down by Julius III, in his brief to the cardinal, was never lost sight of, and accordingly all in whose ordination the form and intention of the church had been neglected, were reordained.*

It would lead us too far away to enter into biblical disquisitions, to which Mr. Evans would introduce us;† but the argument of Dr. Kenrick is independent of verbal controversies. He maintains that one who is not a priest can not be made a bishop, and that the ordinal of Edward VI did not express the power of priesthood. This argument remains unanswered.

The closing chapter, on "Mission," shows that Mr. Evans fully feels the difficulties of Anglican pretensions. He is mistaken in supposing that mission, or jurisdiciion, is conveyed by ordination. According to the principles of canon law it may precede or follow it, and is independent of it. He is greatly astray if he fancies that the civil power can supply it, as he must know it professed to do under Edward VI and Elizabeth. It is a theological error to suppose that a bishop, not having jurisdiction, can supply the wants of vacant churches by ordaining bishops for them, whatever be their necessity, for no one can give what he has not, and the apostolic commission has not descended in its plenitude to bishops severally and separately.

The order of the church has been well provided for by her divine Founder, according to whose institution the streams of ecclesiastical authority must flow from the fountain-head where it can never fail. Britain was within the limits of the western patriarchate, and subject to the immediate control of the Roman bishop, who, in several instances, consecrated the archbishops of Canterbury; and this patriarchal superintendence took nothing from the rights of the primacy. Whatever power was enjoyed by the successor of Augustin emanated from the successor of Gregory. When Parker was appointed by a mock ordination, or was ordained by a rite sanctioned by the British parliament, he occupied the seat of Pole; but he was the creature of Elizabeth, his power flowed from her; he was a *civil* bishop, the first of a new race, having no real connection with the long line of illustrious men that, during nine hundred years, had presided over the English hierarchy. The American Protestant Episcopal bishops may trace their origin to the mother country by as many lines as they please; the Catholic prelates rely on the same title on which Augustin relied, the founder of the see of Canterbury.

Although Mr. Evans has displayed much of the ingenuity which, in Rome, they ascribe to *l' avvocato del diavolo*, he has failed, in our judgment, to overturn the main positions of Dr. Kenrick, whatever may be thought of minor points, such as the criterion of genuine commissions, on which we feel ourselves incompetent to pronounce. We are gratified at the appearance of his work, which must give new interest to an investigation highly important, especially in this advanced stage of the movement on the other side of the Atlantic. The devotedness of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Newman, Mr. Ward, and their friends, to antiquity, their reverence for authority, and their love of unity, have completely won our admiration, and we would rejoice in being able to recognise their titles to ministerial power, which, on abjuring schism, they might exercise with great advantage; but we can see no ground for their claims, and can only pray that they may, by their entire submission to the authority of the church, soon prove worthy to be raised to a dignity of which the shadow only remains among them. Like nocturnal spectres, the venerable forms of the Christian priesthood and prelacy haunt their imagination, and they fancy themselves clothed with the awful power to offer the unbloody victim, and bow to the shadows that hover round the episcopal chairs. Soon may the delusion vanish, and the realities of Catholic communion fill the longings of their hearts!

*P. 234. †P. 224.

THE "SABBATH" QUESTION.

1. *Report of the National Convention of the Lord's Day.* Baltimore Sun, December 28th and 29th, 1844.

2. *The Assembly's Shorter Catechism, illustrated by appropriate Anecdotes, chiefly designed to assist parents and Sabbath school teachers in the instruction of youth.* New York: R. Carter.

HE convention that recently met in Baltimore, in relation to the observance of the Sunday, we consider a natural and very favorable opportunity of placing before the public a few remarks upon the observance of the Lord's day, especially in regard to certain erroneous notions on this subject which are very prevalent among our Protestant brethren, and which have, in this way, been more or less introduced among a portion of the Catholic community. With this view, we have been anxiously but fruitlessly waiting for an official and complete report of the proceedings of the said convention, which, it was understood, was to be published by regularly appointed officers of that body who had been empowered during the session to raise a collection for this object. Not to be altogether out of time with our remarks, we will use the report of the "Sabbath" convention, as furnished at the time by the Baltimore *Sun*, the more so as this paper was commended by the finance committee for the accuracy of its statements on the occasion.

The scheme of a national convention, "so called," for the better observance of the Lord's day, originated with the *Maryland State Sabbath Convention.* Invitations were tendered to a few individuals in various states, and delegates, some of whom had not even provided themselves with a certificate of their appointment, convened in Baltimore, towards the end of last November, to discuss the grave questions connected with the observance of the Lord's day, and to bring about a salutary reform on this point throughout the union. These delegates were of every rank and profession in society, but chiefly ministers of different creeds and sects. It is needless to say that the Catholic body was not represented, and we understand also that the Episcopalians did not participate in the proceedings of the convention.* Such was the promiscuous assembly of a handful of doctors, lawyers, judges, and preachers, of laymen and clergymen of every grade, that styled itself a national convention of the friends of the Lord's day, and undertook to offer suggestions to the people of the United States concerning its observance. It does not seem to have occurred to any of them that their assumption of the title of *national* convention was rather gratuitous, inasmuch as ecclesiastical matters are not to be settled by assemblies of this description. We also doubt the constitutionality of such conventions as the one alluded to: but, assuredly, if such an exhibition is not against the letter, it is opposed to the spirit of the constituton. Does not the constitution leave every individual free to worship God as he thinks proper, and in the way which is most conformable to his religious principles? Does not the constitution secure him against all molestation from any individual or from any body of individuals? Is not the observance of the "Sabbath" one of those points upon which every one is free to follow his own views? Has any person at least a right to introduce new restraints, new impediments, new restrictions in addition to those which were adopted at the time of the formation of our Union? Does any one possess the right to interfere with a Jew who observes the Saturday instead of Sunday? Is any one authorized to sit in judgment upon, and to convict the Seventh day Baptists who do not choose to keep the Sunday? Where would the mistaken zeal, or rather the fanaticism of Sabbath zealots end, if allowed to gain an inch of ground beyond what they already possess? With the false notions which are current among many, and the unreasona-

*The *N. York Churchman*, alluding to this, says: "Time will be, we hope, when all our people will be as consistent in regard to such amalgamations as Roman Catholics."

bleness of which we will establish in the sequel, we have no security that at some future day we may not all be ordered by public authority, and upon Scriptural grounds too, to eat cold victuals on Sunday, to kindle no fire on that blessed day, and in winter to bask in the sun for the purpose of warming ourselves? Who knows but we may see fastened by iron bolts, on the Lord's day, all the toll-gates and avenues round the city, in order to stop more effectually all unnecessary travelling, and shall be required, by a city ordinance, to wear a long melancholy face from sunset on Saturday to sunset on Sunday? We hope that this will never be the case, and that one set of Christians will never be allowed to trample so grossly upon the rights of another. Yet we can not refrain from expressing our regret in witnessing this tendency in certain quarters to inquisitorial measures; and we candidly avow that this spirit appears to us little creditable to the liberty of conscience, of which we boast and ought to boast, as American republicans.

We deem it fortunate that the convention was honored with the presence and assistance of our venerable ex-president, the Hon. John Quincy Adams. The old gentleman, in his address on taking the chair, distinctly stated that there existed a diversity of opinion respecting the observance of the Sabbath which he had not yet fully examined; and he observed, moreover, that Christ had said: "the *Sabbath* was made for man and not man for the *Sabbath.*" This remark may possibly have damped, though it certainly did not extinguish, the fervor of the members. Mr. Adams appears to be one of those who do not consider walking or riding as a species of Sabbath violation. This was his opinion at least some time ago; and we should regret his adoption now of a more rigid doctrine and practice on this point; for we know not how it might be interpreted. Some would certainly apply to him the French saying: *Quand le diable devint vieux, il se fit hermite:* "when the devil grew old, he turned a hermit." It must have been a matter of deep regret and mortification, and it was certainly a great loss for the convention, that the Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen did not think proper to grace with his personal attendance the deliberations of that body. Judging from his well known zeal and labors in the Sabbath cause, his coöperation would have proved most efficient.

We are aware that the Protestant churches lay claim to superior sanctity and a more perfect observance of the law of God, on account of the strictness with which they keep "the Sabbath." For this reason too the most serious charges are preferred against the Catholic church, and there is a general outcry about the deplorable violation of the Sabbath in Catholic countries. Some impartial critics would be almost tempted to say that, on this one point at least, zeal, piety, and enlightened religion, are found on the side of the reformation. Protestant travellers improve this opportunity of rousing the indignation of their countrymen against the ancient church, by imputing to Catholics a great laxity of practice on this point. In the following remarks our principal object will be to rectify these erroneous ideas, by a proper discussion of the question regarding the observance of the Lord's day. The doings and sayings of the convention will afford us ample scope for our observations; and it will be seen which side can justly lay claim to a true, real, and enlightened religion.

At the birth of Protestantism the church was already in possession of a Christian and rational, though not a Jewish and hypocritical observance of the Sunday. The reformers seized with avidity upon this opportunity of affecting a superior virtue and holiness, and proclaimed the obligation of observing this day more rigidly. Had they found a stricter method of keeping it established in the church, they would most probably have rejected it, and inculcated a milder and more liberal observance of the Sunday. This we have reason to infer from the fact that they rejected fasting, abstinence, and clerical celibacy, and other restraints upon the passions, and gave no evidence, in their lives, of a disposition to enforce the exact observance of Christian morality. From the remarks we shall offer on this question, it will appear, we trust, that the Catholic church, in her regulations concerning the Sunday, has given ample proof of her faithful adherence to Scripture, and to the true spirit of the new law, and has shown herself on this, as on other points, to be guided by the Spirit of God; that, on the contrary, the Protestant churches, or at least many of them, afford, in their tenets on this subject, in the palpable contradictions which prevail among them, in the inconsistency of their reasonings, and in the excessive rigor of

their principles, every reason to believe that they are guided by the spirit of man. We shall make it appear that, whilst professing to reject tradition, they tamely bow down to it; that while they profess to prove every thing from Scripture, they admit an important doctrinal point, in the total absence of scriptural evidence: or rather they make the Scriptures testify, but cunningly wrest them from their natural and obvious sense. It is difficult to restrain one's indignation in witnessing the cant of certain men, because they remind us of those Pharisees who strained at a gnat and swallowed a camel; who, being blind themselves, attempted to lead others; and who perceived a mote in their neighbor's eye, while they did not see the beam in their own. These Pharisees too had the Sabbath always on their lips, and the most serious fault they charged upon the Son of God was the violation of the Sabbath. It is a part of the glory of the Catholic church to share the very reproach for which her divine Founder was hated, persecuted, and put to death.

The convention passed twenty-six resolutions, all stamped more or less with the seal of bigotry, replete with false views, and characterized by false assertions and false reasonings; and it is not a little surprising how they could have been adopted with so little debate and opposition. Only one or two members exhibited from the very outset, symptoms of opposition; Mr. R. Lemmon, of Baltimore, in particular, who objected to the word Sabbath being used to designate the day which Christians keep holy. He wished the framers of the resolutions to found them on scriptural authority; he drew a broad line of distinction between the Judaical Sabbath and the Lord's day, and pointed out the different modes of observing these two days. These remarks, however plausible in appearance, soon roused the spirit of members, some of whom were for putting the resolutions *under* the table; and the vociferations and hisses that now followed sufficiently proved to the unfortunate gentleman on the floor, that he was cutting too deep into the prejudices of his brethren. The close of the convention exhibited another instance of Christian harmony, which is worthy of notice. The question was whether the convention should remonstrate with Congress upon the impropriety of allowing the Saturday night sessions to encroach upon Sunday morning. The discussion grew tolerably warm; and at one time there was some danger of the assembly's terminating like another, which must have been held about the same period at Berlin. An association for the improvement of the *internal man* held its first meeting in that city under the presidency of M. Urban, the projector of the society, and scarcely had the second speech been made when the debate became very animated, and all the members fell to talking loud, and quarreling; but this proving ineffectual, the *external man* was brought at once into further action by a general exchange of kicks and blows. So much for associations and meetings of laymen for the regulation of religious matters.

We shall now proceed to the discussion of the topics touched upon in the various resolutions of the convention, and we distinctly affirm, notwithstanding the gratuitous assertions and unfounded suppositions of the above mentioned resolutions, that to keep holy one day in seven is not a precept of the natural law; much less is it a precept of the natural law to keep it holy in the way in which the Jews were commanded to observe it. A precept of the natural law is one which nature has instilled into our hearts; which our reason alone, that spark of divine light communicated to man at his creation, teaches to be a command of God. The precept "thou shalt not kill," is a part of the natural law. But the same can not be said of the following injunction: "keep one day holy out of seven." Why one out of seven, more than one out of two, or three, or ten? Still less does reason tell us to "keep one day holy out of seven by doing no work on that day." The law of nature indeed loudly proclaims the obligation of worshipping God; but it does not say that one day should be devoted to it, or devoted to it by abstaining from work. The law of nature would rather incline us to say that all days should be kept holy, and it would further suggest to us that a day may be kept holy by working as well as by abstaining from work; because we may be said to glorify God, when we are engaged in those occupations which have been instituted by his providence.

Another proof of our assertion is, that no man of sense would reproach an infidel or an Indian, who has never heard of Christianity,

for not resting one day out of seven, though he would certainly have reason to censure him for violating the precepts of the natural law, "thou shalt not kill," "thou shalt not commit adultery," &c. We assert moreover, in direct opposition to the resolutions of the convention, that the law of the Sabbath has not existed in all ages of the world; but that this religious practice originated with the Jews at the command of God, more than two thousand years after the creation of the world. Sabbath zealots take it for granted that the observance of the seventh day originated in Eden, when God, after having created and arranged the world in six days, rested on the seventh. But this supposition is altogether gratuitous, and from the following considerations we are led to believe it false. No mention is made in Genesis of the observance of the Sabbath by the patriarchs before the institution of the Judaical Sabbath: the word Sabbath itself is not found either in Genesis, or in the book of Job, who followed only the law of nature; on the contrary, they mention customs that were prevalent at that period, and which our Sabbath men would consider wholly irreconcilable with the proper observance of the day; for instance, the custom of continuing a marriage feast during seven days. This practice existed among the gentiles even after the promulgation of the Mosaic law; it was observed among the Philistines, and consisted of a banquet which lasted for seven full days, as may be seen in the history of Samson.* This custom of solemnizing the marriage ceremony by a seven days' festivity, is plainly alluded to in Genesis, where it is stated that a large number of friends having been invited to the marriage feast of Jacob, Laban said to his son-in-law, "Make up the week of days of this match;" and when the week was past, Jacob married Rachel.† We read also that Joseph with a great company‡ buried his father Jacob in the land of Canaan, "where, celebrating the exequies with a great and vehement lamentation, they spent full seven days;" and consequently the Sabbath did not prevent them from celebrating the exequies of Jacob. This clearly indicates that the Sabbath was not yet instituted; but the following passage of Exodus, ch. 16, v. 22-30, when the rest of the Sabbath was first introduced, renders it evident. The manna had fallen from heaven, and the Jews had received an order to gather twice as much on Friday as on other days, and this being done, the rulers of the multitude came to inquire of Moses why this extraordinary quantity should be gathered: particularly as on other occasions the superfluous manna had turned to putrefaction. "On the sixth day they gathered twice as much, that is, two gomors every man: and all the rulers of the multitude came, and told Moses, and he said to them, this is what the Lord hath spoken: to-morrow is the rest of the Sabbath, sanctified to the Lord. Whatsoever work is to be done, do it, and the meats that are to be dressed, dress them, and whatsoever shall remain, lay it up until the morning, and they did so as Moses had commanded, and it did not putrify, neither was there worm found in it, and Moses said: Eat it to-day, because it is the Sabbath of the Lord: to-day it shall not be found in the field. Gather it six days: but on the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord; therefore it shall not be found. And the seventh day came, and some of the people going forth to gather found none. And the Lord said to Moses: How long will you refuse to keep my commandments and my law? See that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, and for this reason on the sixth day he giveth you a double provision: let each man stay at home, and let none go forth out of his place the seventh day: and the people kept the Sabbath on the seventh day."

This last remark, together with the whole tenor of the passage, shows incontrovertibly, we think, that the observance of the Sabbath began on that day, which was antecedent to the period when Jehovah commanded from the smoking summit of Sina, "Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day." Some, it is true, might be tempted to derive the institution of the Sabbath from the words of Moses, which are found in the second chapter of Genesis, verse 3d, where it is asserted that "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because in it he had rested from all his work." But the inference would be unfounded, inasmuch as nothing is there said about the obligation of abstaining from work, and the facts which we have adduced show that this obligation was not supposed to exist before the promulgation of the Jewish law. After the creation, the Lord "sanctified" the seventh

*Jud. xiv, 12. †Genesis xxix. ‡Genesis l.

day, because he intended to set it apart for his worship under the Judaical dispensation, for which the old Testament was principally written. Hence the division of time into periods of seven days was known to almost all nations, as an arrangement derived from the primeval custom of mankind; but the Jews alone, as Theophilus, an ancient author of the second century, remarks,* observed the seventh day in a religious manner. Their practice on this point gave rise to that silly remark of Seneca, the pagan philosopher, that the Jews wasted the seventh part of their life.† The doctrine which we have asserted, that the precept of weekly rest is not a part of the natural law, and was not observed by the patriarchs before the time of Moses, is, for the reasons we have assigned, admitted by the most able divines and canonists. Among the ancient writers we may mention Irenæus, Tertullian, and Eusebius. But after the opinion of these grave authors, and the reasons given above, what shall we think of the unqualified assertion, found in the address of the convention, and directed to the people of the United States, that "it is a law of God, coeval with creation," and that it is a law called for by our physical, social and moral necessities, "not only on tablets of stone, but on the bodies and souls of men, and is armed with a penalty which no continued violation of it can either annul or evade;" and in the ninth resolution, that "the sabbatical law was engraven." All these assertions are at least purely gratuitous; we have shown, moreover, that they are fraught with error, the more unpardonable, as they who assume the task of dictating to a whole nation are imperatively bound to examine maturely beforehand those matters which they commend to public consideration. It might just as well have been said that the physical necessities of the land required us to rest every seventh year as was prescribed to the Jews.‡ The Sabbath, understood in that servile and Judaical sense in which most of the Sabbath men take it, is not only uncalled for by our physical, social, and moral necessities, but is in reality, as it was for the Jews, a burden from which we have been relieved. This was positively asserted in the council of Jerusalem by St. Peter, when he exclaimed, "Why tempt you God to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?"* But the Sabbath, according to the Christian practice, and as the Catholic church wishes us to keep it, proves a source of invaluable blessings to man, and in that way only can it be said to be wonderfully adapted to his physical, social, and moral necessities.

Having shown that the law of the Sabbath is not a necessary consequence of the natural law, we must conclude that it was a precept of the Mosaic dispensation, which bound the descendants of Abraham, from the period when the manna fell from heaven to the time when the Redeemer abrogated the old law, and restored mankind to their primitive liberty in regard to the religious observance of Saturday.

But we have two remarks to make upon this Judaical law; the first is that it forbade, with the greatest rigor, and under very severe penalties, any kind of work to be performed on the Sabbath; secondly, it enjoined no attendance at divine worship, or, to use a common phrase, no going to church. The first point is admitted by all, and appears manifestly from the fact that the Jews on the Sabbath day could not dress meat, kindle a fire, carry a burden, or go any distance, and that the punishment of death was inflicted upon the violator of this precept. The other point, however, that there was no obligation for the Jews to assist at public worship, is not so generally known, particularly among those who take the Mosaical law as the standard of our obligations on Sunday. But there is not one passage in the Bible which prescribes any particular form of prayer, either private or public, to be recited on that day, or any reading of the Scripture, or any other act of divine worship. It is true the law commanded the Jews to keep the Sabbath holy; but this sanctification or holiness of the Sabbath is always made to consist in abstaining from every kind of work on that day. This constituted the honor which the Almighty claimed for it; that is, the Jews were required by a divine command to abstain from work on the Sabbath, in order to imitate, and, as it were, to commemorate the rest of God after the creation of the world. The words which we have quoted above in relation to the first Sabbath observed by the people of God, establish this point very

* Lib. ii. †St. Austin, De civit. Dei, l. 6, c. xi.
‡ Exod. xxiii, 10, 11.

* Act. xv, 10.

plainly: "To-morrow is the rest of the Sabbath sanctified to the Lord. Let each man stay at home, and let none go forth out of his place the seventh day." Assuredly they could not on that day have read the Scriptures, since there were none. The law of Moses prescribed certain sacrifices on the Sabbath;* but the people were not obliged to attend them; it would indeed have been an utter impossibility for them to do so; it was an obligation for the priests only. We learn, however, from Philo the Jew, that Moses ordered the people to meet on the seventh day in order "to hear the Scriptures sitting;" and we find this usage alluded to in the New Testament. But Philo lived nearly two thousand years after Moses; and, there being no mention of such a precept in the Scripture, his testimony can have little weight among those who reject tradition. The practice of reading the Scriptures seems to have been introduced, not as the requirement of any positive precept, as none can be shown to this effect, but as a natural consequence of the rest which the Jews were bound to keep, and which suggested the free performance of this religious act. It is true that the ninety-second Psalm is headed, "for the Sabbath day." But there is no precept declaring that it was obligatory on any person to sing or to hear it sung; and the date of the Psalter, being much posterior to the time of Moses, shows that the use of this portion of Scripture could not have been prescribed by that legislator. Protestants adduce another passage to prove the necessity of public worship on the Sabbath, from the 66th chapter of Isaiah. They read it thus: "And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." But the Scripture here speaks of the new law, not of the old; and it declares just the reverse of what they want to deduce from it; for it says that, from month to month, from Sabbath to Sabbath, all flesh shall come to worship before God; that is, *all* days will be days of prayer and supplication.

We contend, in the next place, that the Sabbath for which some of our dissenting brethren evince so much zeal, and which they wish to establish in a Christian community, was abolished by Christ, and ceased to be binding as soon as the new law was promulgated by the apostles. This is a necessary consequence of what has been proved above, namely, that the observance of the Sabbath was a precept of the Judaical, not of the natural law; for the former, as all admit, was abrogated by the Saviour; otherwise we should still be bound to abstain from unclean animals, to keep the new moons, to practise circumcision, &c. All the political, judicial, and ceremonial precepts of the Mosaic law have passed away; they expired on the same cross to which Christ nailed "the hand-writing of death that stood against us." The moral or natural obligations alone remain, that is, those which are engraven on the heart of man, and the necessity of which is proclaimed by enlightened reason; for instance, "thou shalt not kill." These precepts Jesus Christ confirmed in express terms: *Matth.* xix, 18 *et seq.;* xxii, 37 *et seq.* But he did not say a word about the Sabbath. On the contrary, the whole tenor of his public life showed that the ceremonial law of the Sabbath was verging to the period of its termination; for he acted in a way which excited against him the hatred of the scribes and Pharisees, as if he were a Sabbath breaker. Every one has read of the memorable occasion when, traversing the fields on a Sabbath day, and his disciples having plucked a few ears of corn, he spoke those solemn words: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, and the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath." He declared himself the Lord and Master of the Judaical Sabbath, intimating that he would abolish it, and would lead his apostles and his church to appoint another day to be kept holy, not after the manner of the ancient Sabbath, but in a way better adapted to the new dispensation of liberty and love.

The object of the first council held in the Christian church was to settle a controversy that had arisen on this point, and to determine whether the law of Moses was binding upon Christians. It was on that occasion that the prince of the apostles so keenly reproved the Judaizing spirit which had manifested itself, saying: "Now, therefore, why tempt you God to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?"* Whoever is acquainted with

* Lev. xxiv; Num. xx.

* Acts xv, 10.

the rigor of the old sabbatical law, will grant that it was by no means an inconsiderable part of that intolerable yoke of which the apostle speaks. The council of Jerusalem, therefore, decided that, with the exception of a few points which were specified, and the obligation of which was to continue a while longer, the law of Moses was not binding; and as these few points do not include the Sabbath, it follows clearly that the Sabbath was abrogated.

Were it necessary to confirm, still further, the remarks which we have advanced, we could easily effect our object by adducing the declarations of St. Paul. From the strong hold which the sabbatical law had acquired in the minds and hearts of the Jews, and from the very nature of this precept, it was natural to expect that many would cling with pertinacity to its observance; for this reason the apostles, at the first council, pronounced the Judaical customs unnecessary, though they were not strictly forbidden, at least when adherence to them was not founded upon heretical and superstitious motives. In this case they were unequivocally denounced. Thus St. Paul reproved the Galatians who supposed the Judaical rites to be necessary for salvation: "You observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am in fear for you, lest, perhaps, I have labored in vain among you."* The days here alluded to are plainly Sabbath days. This apostle expressly recommended to those who knew that the Sabbath had been abolished, not to rail at or condemn their weaker brethren who did not enter so willingly into the same sentiment, through partiality for the synagogue in which they had been instructed. His directions on this and similar topics may be found in the fourteenth chapter to the Romans: "One judgeth between day and day, and another judgeth every day. Let every man abound in his own sense." Again, in the Epistle to the Colossians (ch. ii, v. 16), he unqualifiedly asserts: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbaths." Does not this evidently suppose that there was no obligation to keep the Sabbath any more than the new moon, or the law which established a distinction of meats? The conclusion then is irresistible, that to adduce scriptural passages from the books of Moses, as Protestants do, with a view to regulate the observance of the Lord's day, supposes a gross ignorance of the apostolic practice as recorded in the Acts, as well as of the doctrine so manifestly taught by St. Paul. But more of this in the sequel.

We will now proceed to show that Protestants, who pretend to be consistent, have no reason to assert that the Sunday has taken the place of the ancient Sabbath, as they generally suppose. For a Protestant must, from the very nature of the peculiar system of religion which he professes, from the fundamental tenet which he holds, prove by scriptural authority that Sunday has taken the place of the Sabbath; because the Scripture, as he tells us, is the sole rule of faith and morality. To Scripture alone we must refer for the determination of the worship due to God, and whatever is not found in Scripture is the vain tradition of men, and therefore can not become obligatory. Now we think that it can be rigorously demonstrated that the substitution of Sunday for the Saturday has no scriptural warrant, and, consequently, if it can be proved that Protestants have received from tradition this practice and law, for the observance of which they show so much zeal, they must, to be consistent, admit also the use of pictures and images, of prayers for the dead, &c., as coming to us through the same channel that has made known to us the obligation of keeping Sunday in the place of Saturday. The members of the Sabbath convention should have been the less disposed to set aside the necessity of scriptural evidence for the Lord's day, as they teach the people of the United States that this commandment can not be said to be "secondary in importance or obligation to any. For aught we know, it may be the very key-stone of the arch." Assuredly, according to them, God could not have left man without any positive declaration of his will concerning the most important of all obligations, and that which forms the key-stone of his commandments; and as on the one side he has declared in the Scripture very plainly and unequivocally that the Sabbath is abrogated, he must also tell us in the same plain and unequivocal manner that another day has been substituted in the place of it.

* Gal. ii, 10.

The question then is, where are the Scripture proofs and evidences that the Sunday has succeeded to all the privileges of the ancient Sabbath? We must answer plainly, there are none; there is not a shadow of any such evidence; or if there be any shadow of proof in Scripture, it is as faint and obscure for proving the necessity of keeping the Sunday, as the testimony for the abolition of the Sabbath is plain and obvious. This may partly account for the unfavorable reception of a remark offered during the convention, that the Sabbath is not the Lord's day, and that the convention should give Scripture authority for their various resolutions. As the convention declined adducing Scripture, we thought it necessary to consult the catechetical books of Protestants to supply the deficiency. This we have done, and we will here quote the following question of the Baptist catechism, with the Scripture authority recorded in the same, which is the fullest we could find, to show the hallucination of those who maintain that the Scripture is clear, independently of the traditions of men, and that it contains every thing required for our belief and practice. In transcribing it we confess we could not help feeling something of indignation against those who practise upon the people such imposition as is found in these pretended scriptural proofs, and we could not but pity the simplicity of those who are caught in the snare.

"*Question.* Which day of the seven hath God appointed to be the weekly Sabbath?

"*Answer.* Before the resurrection of Christ God appointed the seventh day of the week to be the weekly Sabbath,* and the first day of the week ever since, to continue to the end of the world, which is the Christian Sabbath."†

We have selected this catechism because it gives the fullest scriptural evidence according to the promise in the title page: "The Baptist catechism, to which are added the PROOFS out of the SCRIPTURES in words at length." In fact, we might search the Scriptures from beginning to end, and no other passages could be found having even the most indirect bearing upon this question. We now ask the candid reader what proof can be adduced from these passages to show that the first day of the week or Sunday was appointed by God as a "weekly Sabbath?" The first text of St. John proves only that Christ rose on the first day of the week, and not only is there no mention of rest from ordinary work, but it is ludicrous to cite this as an instance of a Christian assembly on Sunday in honor of Christ's resurrection, for at that time the apostles partly doubted the truth of that resurrection. Equally illusory is the argument derived from the fact that John had a revelation on the Lord's day; for, if we confine ourselves to Scripture alone, that Lord's day might be some one day (Easter) in the year, and not one day of the week; moreover, the first day of the week might have been called the Lord's day, without implying any other obligation than that of a grateful remembrance; in short, there is nothing in this text to show that the prerogatives of the Sabbath have been transferred to the Lord's day. As to the direction of St. Paul to the Corinthians, to lay up on the first day of the week whatever they wished to contribute to the collection for the faithful, it would require an extraordinary power of mind to gather from this expression that the first day of the week is the one on which we must abstain from work and apply exclusively to the worship of God.

We come now to the text which seems to bear more directly on the question, in which it is said that on the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them. Though this passage, as well as that of the Apocalypse, when explained by the voice of tradition, may account for the origin of our Sunday, it is not the less certain that, separately considered, it is by no means capable of convincing the mind that the privileges of Saturday have, by divine command, been transferred to the Sunday. For the words, *the first day of the week*, which are so clear in the English translation, are not so obvious in the

* *Exodus* xxxi, 15. Six days may work be done, but on the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord; whosoever doth any work on the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death.

† *John* xx, 19. The same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.

Acts xx, 7. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.

1 *Cor.* xvi, 1, 2. Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye; upon the first day of the week let every one lay by him in store as God hath prospered him.

Rev. i, 10. I was in the spirit upon the Lord's day.

original text, which literally signifies, "on one of the Sabbaths." The centuriators of Magdeburg interpret this passage of the Sabbath itself. Though we admit that the common translation is correct, we must confess that it is not as clear as many persons imagine. Again, all that appears from this passage is that, for the particular occasion spoken of by the inspired writer, the faithful met on the first day of the week; but this does not prove at all that there is a general obligation to meet on that day. It is not improbable that they met more than once a week, and even if they had done so, there would be no obligation to do the same. Moreover, admitting the obligation of meeting on the first day of the week, there is not a word about abstaining from work during the *day*, particularly as the meeting was held at *night*, when a young man overpowered with sleep fell from an upper story. We read in the Acts* that the faithful continued *daily* in the temple, breaking bread from house to house. Certainly this does not prove that all Christians are bound to do the same. Hence the fact of the faithful having met on Sunday does not establish a similar obligation for all, especially as it is said in the Acts that the apostles preached on Saturday, though there is now no obligation to meet on that day to hear the instructions of the pastors of the church. Further; if this passage of the Acts proved any thing regarding the Sunday, it would prove the obligation of *breaking bread*, that is, of celebrating the Lord's supper *every Sunday*. This Catholics do, indeed, but Protestants do it not, and they do not consider it necessary to perform this rite oftener than once a month, if they perform it at all. Finally, if the nocturnal meeting spoken of in this chapter lasted from Saturday night to Sunday morning, as is probable from the fact that this religious service was instituted in honor of Christ's resurrection, which certainly took place on that night, and also from the fact that the Sabbath of the Jews ended on Saturday evening, it is plain that travelling on Sundays was authorized by the apostles; for the chapter in question positively asserts that Paul started by land and his companions by sea, on the following day. What an unpalatable inference this for our brethren of the convention, whose zeal was displayed chiefly against travelling on the Sabbath, introducing to public notice new species of conveyances, such as "Sabbath breaking cars and Sabbath breaking boats!"

From all these considerations it is obvious that the Scripture does not speak of the Sunday as a substitute for Saturday, nor teach that the obligations of the Sabbath have passed to the Lord's day. Protestants, therefore, who retain the Sunday, and deny the necessity of tradition, are altogether inconsistent. The Seventh day Baptists are less inconsistent in keeping Saturday, because, there being no warrant for the observance of Sunday instead of the ancient Sabbath, they can at least show that the latter was prescribed in the Old Testament. But a Protestant who would reason soundly and rigorously, would be led either to deny altogether the obligation of keeping the Sunday holy, or he must listen to the voice of tradition; and, if he admit the Sunday from the tradition of the church, why should he not also admit confession, prayers for the dead, and other points which are still more clearly established by tradition than the obligation of observing the Lord's day?

The reader may now understand why modern sectarists evince such a preference for the word "Sabbath," and, despite all remonstrance against it, persist in applying this name to the first day of the week, or Sunday. According to their fundamental principles, they must adduce scriptural argument in support of their views; now there is no scriptural warrant for Sunday, but there is an abundance of it for Saturday, or the Sabbath. They agree, therefore, to give the name of Sabbath to the first day of the week, and in this way they are enabled to produce a multitude of passages from the sacred text to sustain the obligation of observing it. But the reflecting mind will readily perceive that this is nothing more than a kind of theological legerdemain, that might be placed on a par with a contrivance extensively adopted at one period, of translating the word *idol* in the Scriptures by *image*, in order to enkindle in the breast of the reader a holy zeal against a practice of the Catholic church.

From tradition and from the practice of the Christian world only can we learn the obligation and the manner of keeping Sunday. This tradition of the church, found in the early records of Christianity, teaches us that the apostles themselves gave to the Sunday the

* Chapter ii, v. 46.

name of the Lord's day; that on the Lord's day, ever since the time of the apostles, it has been the custom to assemble in churches, to break bread, that is, to offer the holy sacrifice of the mass; and that on the same day, as is intimated in the 2d Epistle to the Corinthians, quoted above, and is eloquently expressed by St. John Chrysostom, the faithful made their offerings in the church. "The pastors of the church decreed," says St. Austin, ser. 251, "that all the glory of the Judaical Sabbath should be transferred to the Lord's day, in order that we should celebrate the reality of what the Jews observed only in figure." The same doctor explains how the third precept of the decalogue is observed by Christians. He states that the third commandment is kept by Christians *spiritually*, because on that day they apply to the worship of God, which constitutes the true rest of man.* But he is equally positive in asserting that Christians do not observe the third commandment carnally: "For," says he, "Christ has removed from us the yoke of the carnal observances," among which he reckons the obligation of abstaining from necessary works on the seventh day as the Jews were obliged to do.†

The Christian church then has determined the obligation of keeping the Sunday, and to her and her alone are we to look for the manner of observing it. She has positively declared that the Lord's day is not to be kept as the Sabbath of old; in other words, that the Christian Sunday is to be kept, not according to the injunctions of Exodus and Leviticus, but according to her own ordinances; and she has unequivocally declared that the observance of that day, although an imitation of the Jewish Sabbath instituted by Jehovah on Mount Sina, does not impose the same obligations, is directed by a different spirit, and is neither so rigid nor servile in its character. Our Sunday is not a revival of the ancient Sabbath, it is a voluntary imitation of it; and hence nothing can be more preposterous, more Judaical, or antichristian, than to quote the old law for the observance of Sunday.

To place this subject in a clearer light, we may state that, according to many learned writers, it was not strictly commanded to abstain from work on Sunday during the first ages of the church. This day was undoubtedly viewed by Christians as a day of joy, of triumph, and of gratitude to God; and they convened in the church to offer their homage to the Almighty; but there is no evidence to show that cessation from work was considered obligatory; probably because there might have been some danger of Judaism in this cessation from work, and perhaps also because this practice, in the time of persecution, would have greatly exposed the professors of Christianity. It was deemed sufficient to substitute public prayer for the Jewish Sabbath, particularly as the latter was observed by many of the faithful. This opinion is founded on the following reasons. If the Sunday in those days was observed, how could St. Paul have said to the Romans, "one judgeth between day and day, and another judgeth every day; let every man abound in his own sense?" Again, the writers of these times say nothing about a total cessation from work on Sunday, though many of them mention the practice of attending divine service. The apostolic constitutions, which, however, are not of undoubted authenticity, condemn those who, under the pretence of work, do not attend church; but this passage shows that no other cessation from work was expected than that which is necessary for assisting at the public service: for, as the text has it, "only the spare time of the faithful should be devoted to business; piety is their main occupation." The council of Laodicea, which is very ancient, and is quoted by all authors, speaks very explicitly on the subject: "Christians must not Judaize and remain idle on the Sabbath, but apply to work. But let them prefer the Sunday, and show their respect for that day as Christians by abstaining from work, if they choose. If they be found Judaizing, let them be anathema."* Another reason may be given here which has some weight. The Emperor Constantine, after his conversion to Christianity, made the observance of Sunday a civil duty, and the law which commanded it is found in the Roman code. "Let all judges and people of the town rest, and the trades of various kinds be suspended on the venerable day of the sun. Those who live in the country may, however, freely and without fault apply to agriculture, because it often happens that this day is the most favorable for sowing

* L. 19, c. 18, contra Faustum.
† Contra duas epistolas Pelag. cap. 4.

* Labbe v. i, p. 1512.

wheat and planting the vine, lest an opportunity offered by divine liberality be lost with the favorable moment."* Now we can scarcely conceive that Constantine would have excepted agricultural labor, if the church had from time immemorial strictly forbidden among Christians that kind of work which it prohibited at a later period. A council of Orleans, in the year 540, exhibits a more rigid mode of keeping the Sunday, though it tends to confirm our general impression that cessation from servile works was less strictly enforced than it is now. "As an attempt has been made to persuade the people that it is unlawful to travel on Sundays with horses, oxen, and carts, to prepare food for the table, or to do any thing which the cleanliness of houses or persons would seem to require (things which pertain to the Judaical and not to the Christian observance of the Sunday), we decree that it is lawful to do on Sundays what hath hitherto been considered lawful. We think, however, that agricultural pursuits should be suspended." This council consisted of twenty-six bishops from every part of Gaul. At a later period the discipline of the church became more rigid, and the canon law generally forbade servile work on Sunday, with the exception, however, of certain cases which it specifies; and hence it has been the unanimous doctrine of divines, from time immemorial, that cessation from servile work is not only a point of discipline liable to change, but that it can be dispensed with by the ecclesiastical authority whenever a reasonable cause presents itself. Thus the canon law allows the herring fishery on Sunday, when the opportunity of catching the fish suddenly presents itself on that day.† Ecclesiastical tradition has always held, in conformity to the doctrine of the apostles themselves, who considered the observances of the old law abolished, that Sunday was to be kept in a different way from the Sabbath. The proof of this assertion is clearly contained in the authorities above cited; and in the writings of the fathers of the church, who invariably affirm, in drawing a comparison between Saturday and Sunday, that we do in spirit what the Jews did in a carnal manner, and that there is no obligation to abstain from any necessary occupation. The canon law‡ prescribes that the people should be taught on what days they are to abstain from work, "lest they be betrayed into Judaism." The following letter of St. Gregory the Great, inserted in the canon law, is quite apposite to the present subject. "We have been told that certain men of a perverse mind have sowed among you doctrines contrary to our holy faith, namely, that on the Sabbath day it is forbidden to work. What shall I call them but the preachers of Antichrist, who, at his coming, will make men abstain from all work on the Sabbath and on the Lord's day. I have been informed also of the preaching of certain evil-disposed men who say that no one should bathe on the Lord's day. If, indeed, it is question of bathing through a spirit of sensuality, we do not allow it on any day whatever; but if a person resort to it for some useful purpose, we do not forbid it even on the Lord's day." These passages, and innumerable others which it would be easy to adduce, evince a spirit altogether opposed to that of our modern Sabbath zealots, and, we regret to add, that of our Protestant brethren generally. We must except, however, from this charge one or two members of the "convention," who seem to have held more orthodox views on the subject, and for this reason entitled themselves to a volley of abuse which was poured forth in groans and hisses, a mode of reasoning very fashionable now-a-days, and which a vast number of persons consider a very good substitute for courtesy and argument.

But we deem it our duty, and the duty of every sincere Christian, to protest against that puritanical observance of the Sunday, which certain misguided men are seeking, by every possible means, to introduce, and, as it were, to smuggle into the community. Affecting an ultra regard for the Lord's day, this religious cheat may be prejudicial to the simple-minded Christian who has been accustomed to keep the Sunday according to the method of our ancestors, before the rise of Calvinism. We protest against the unfounded notions to which we have alluded, because we consider them as a revival of Judaism, and consequently an attack upon the Christian religion, which has set men free from the ancient observances, and infused into them a new life and a new spirit. It is a matter of surprise to us that they who assail this liberty of the

* Cod. l. 3, deferiis, tit. 12. † Cap. iii, De feriis.
‡ Dis. 3, de Consec.

gospel, do not find their condemnation on that very page of the New Testament which they profess to read so assiduously. If self-love has not drawn a veil over their eyes, they will easily perceive that their zeal for the Sabbath is but a servile imitation of that Pharisaical blindness which led the Jews to murmur against Christ when performing works of mercy on the Sabbath day, and to reprove the man who, after an illness of thirty-eight years, had been cured on the same day. "It is the Sabbath; it is not lawful for thee to take up thy bed." They would condemn the Saviour himself, who made clay on the Sabbath and cured the man who was blind: "This man is not of God, who keepeth not the Sabbath."

We do not wish these inferences to be taken without proof; but a few facts will show that our remarks are far from being unfounded. We quote from the proceedings of the convention.

"The Rev. Mr. O——, in the course of some remarks relative to the travelling of preachers on the Sabbath, alluded, by way of illustration, to having once questioned a colored man about travelling in a steamboat on Sunday, when he replied that Rev. Mr. C—— came up in the same boat."

This exposure drew forth a vigorous defence of Mr. C. against the charge of Sabbath breaking, and elicited a sort of retractation which shows how matters are understood among these gentlemen. The accuser added the following anecdote to the praise of Mr. C.

"On one occasion, he had known him, whilst chaplain to congress, to walk the entire distance from Washington to Alexandria, at which place he was to preach in the evening, after preaching at the capitol in the morning, in order to avoid going in the Sunday boat, and thus, by his presence, to encourage others to violate the Lord's day."

If such is to be our observance of the Sunday, what course should be pursued by clergymen who have several sick-calls on Sunday in different congregations? The following extract from the proceedings of the convention is illustrative of the same puritanical spirit.

"Mr. C., of New York, addressed the convention on the subject of unnecessary travel on the Sabbath day, illustrating his argument by the case of a little girl who lived at Brooklyn, but made it a practice to come across the ferry every Sunday morning to New York, to attend as a member of *his* Sabbath school. There were plenty of Sabbath schools in Brooklyn, and therefore her crossing the ferry was unnecessary, and so he had finally convinced her, she urging her desire to stick to her old school, in which she had previously been taught in New York. This is what he considered unnecessary travelling."

Enlightened conclusion, indeed! Crossing a ferry, to go to Sunday school, unnecessary travelling on the Sabbath!! We could not be more forcibly reminded of the anecdote of the Puritan who hanged his cat on Monday for having killed a mouse on Sunday; or of the still more singular circumstance which occurred in England, in the case of a Jew who boarded in the house of a Christian. Happening to fall into a filthy pit on Saturday, his landlord immediately threw him the end of a rope, in order to draw him out; but the Jew, afraid of violating the Sabbath, would not avail himself of the means of rising from his unpleasant situation, and said to his friend:

"Sabbata nostra colo, de stercore surgere nolo."*

The following day (Sunday), when he was anxious to be extricated from the pit, the landlord very properly rebuked his superstitious spirit by leaving him a little longer where he was, observing:

"Sabbata nostra quidem, Solomon, celebrabis ibidem."†

Being curious to know whence these absurd views on the observance of Sunday emanate, we investigated the subject, and regretted to perceive that men, who undertake the office of religious instruction, are the channels through which these Pharisaical notions are instilled into the youthful mind, and made to enter into the elements of the Christian doctrine. The following extract from a little work entitled "Anecdotes on the Catechism," will prove the truth of our remarks.

"A girl of only eight years of age seemed always much impressed by what she heard at school, and often rehearsed it to her mother after she came home. One evening the teacher had been speaking against the evil of Sabbath profanation, and little N. returned as usual deeply affected by the teacher's remarks. In order to see if she still recollected this subject, her mother requested her, one Sabbath morning, a short time afterwards, to go to the well

*"I keep the Sabbath, friend,
And, therefore, can't ascend."

†"'Tis Sunday, Solomon, you know,
You therefore must remain below."

and fetch some water. She looked her mother in the face, and replied with tears, 'But God will see me, mother; for he sees and knows all that we do. Have you forgotten what we heard in school about the evil of breaking the Sabbath? I will rise early to-morrow morning, and bring you as much water as we please.'"

What infatuation! a child would commit the sin of Sabbath breaking by fetching some water at the request of a mother! We sincerely hope that this silly doctrine will never obtain among our people generally. A rational mind can not but feel indignant at such an imposition upon the unsuspecting hearts of innocent children. The following passage, from the thirteenth chapter of St. Luke, will not be found inapplicable to such cases. "The ruler of the synagogue being angry that Jesus had healed on the Sabbath, answering, said to the multitude: There are six days wherein you ought to work; in them, therefore, come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day. And the Lord answering him, said: Ye HYPOCRITES, doth not every one of you on the Sabbath day loose his ox or his ass from the manger, and lead them to water, and ought not this daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day? And when he said these things, all his adversaries were ashamed, and all the people rejoiced for all the things that were gloriously done by him."

These Sabbath zealots were afterwards the loudest in their accusations of the Son of God, and the most active in procuring his condemnation. They shuddered at the idea of breaking the Sabbath, but they made no scruple to imbrue their hands in innocent blood; they would not enter Pilate's hall, lest they should be contaminated, and yet they clamored most violently for the death of Christ, of him who had traversed their country doing good to all. Thus did they "strain at the gnat and swallow the camel;" and this must necessarily be the issue of all hypocritical worship and affected rigorism. We have witnessed this strange inconsistency in relation to the very point of which we are now speaking. There are many who consider the six days of the week as their own property, but the seventh as belonging to God, and with this idea they think it all right enough to enjoy themselves without any restraint during six days in the week, to indulge as freely as they please in eating and drinking, to frequent theatres and balls, to cheat their neighbor in dealing, to fight duels, to play cards, &c. &c., but on Sundays they are most exemplary, as grave and sedate as judges, and disposed to sing psalms all day. We have known an individual who would be staggering the whole week under the influence of liquor, but on Sunday he would shudder at the bare idea of touching the poisonous cup. He would consider it a crime of the blackest dye to play cards on Sunday, but to carouse six days in the week was a pardonable weakness. Such notions are diametrically opposed to the genuine spirit of Christianity. Not *one* day, but *seven* days in the week belong to God; and he does not allow us to sport six days in the week, on condition that we will think of him on the seventh. But he wishes us to consecrate to him the whole period of our existence; six days in the week, by bearing, in a spirit of patience and love, the labor of mind and body which he has imposed upon us; and the seventh, by employing more time in the exercises of religion, and enjoying with Christian cheerfulness the repose which he grants us. It were a silly and antichristian idea, to imagine that our daily occupations, and the moments of relaxation which we enjoy on Sunday, can not be offered to God as something acceptable to him. This was not the view of the apostle, when he told his followers, "Whether you eat or drink, do all things for the glory of God;" nor were such the views of Christ, who was pleased to spend the greater portion of his life in the simple occupations of mechanical labor, though in this he was as much an object of complacency in the eyes of his heavenly Father, as when he raised the dead to life, and preached the gospel of salvation.

We shall now proceed to a more minute explanation of the manner in which the Lord's day is to be observed, and shall point out some of the false notions that prevail on this subject. We set out with the principle that it is not from passages of the Old Testament that we are to determine what is forbidden, or what commanded on the Lord's day. We have dwelt sufficiently on this point, having shown that the Judaical law was abrogated both as to the day to be observed, and to the manner of observing it; and we can not but lament the strange infatuation of those who are so regardless of Christian usage as to attach the

obligations of the old law to Sunday. If our dissenting brethren, however, are determined to observe the law of Moses, they should observe the whole of it; at least all that relates to the Sabbath. With such a discipline, they could easily find texts of Scripture to sustain them in carrying out the following resolution of the "convention."

"Resolved, that the clergy of the different denominations of Christians of the United States be respectfully requested to preach, annually, a sermon, or sermons, adapted to promote the SCRIPTURAL observance of the Lord's day, and, if convenient to them, to select the month before harvest for such discourse."

The *scriptural observance of the Lord's day* is a paradox. The only idea it can convey is, that the scriptural observance of the ancient Sabbath may be applied to the Lord's day. If this mode of reasoning is to be adopted, the following texts will no doubt be introduced, with an appropriate application.

"You shall kindle no fire in any of your habitations on the Sabbath day."—*Exodus* xxxv, 3. Supported by this text, the preacher will justly yield to the burning indignation which the general violation of this divine command must enkindle in his breast. He will also declare his intention never to preach in a church in which a fire has been kindled, as he would otherwise encourage the sin of Sabbath breaking. He will also probably suggest the propriety of presenting a petition to the legislature, for the purpose of preventing the kindling of fires in our various cities on the Sabbath day.

"Jehovah spoke from Mount Sina: Keep you my Sabbath, for it is holy unto you. He that shall profane it shall be put to death; he that shall do any work in it, his soul shall perish out of the midst of his people. Six days shall you do work; on the seventh day is the Sabbath, the rest holy to the Lord. Every one that shall do any work on this day shall die."—*Exodus* xxxi, 14 *et seq.* Here the preacher will inveigh with due severity against the weakness and pusillanimity of Christian governments who connive at Sabbath breaking, and neglect the holy ordinance of the Lord, and he will threaten all civil rulers with the thunderbolts of divine justice, unless they forthwith restore that part of the law, and inflict the penalty of death upon all those who in any way violate the Sabbath.

"From evening until evening you shall celebrate your Sabbath."—*Leviticus* xxxiii, 32. With the aid of this text, the minister will denounce the ungodly practice of holding markets on Saturday night, when the Sabbath has already commenced.

"Let each man stay at home, and let none go forth out of his place the seventh day."—*Exodus* xvi, 29. This part of the law, if well observed, would save a vast deal of trouble to the ministers of the gospel, as well as much unnecessary declamation. Would it not be well to force every man to remain within doors on the Sabbath?

These few passages from the Old Testament would go far towards the reformation of abuses, and others could be employed for a further improvement of the sabbatical observance, until at length all the practices of Judaism would be gradually revived amongst us; for, we repeat it, if the law of the Sabbath is obligatory, why would not the other laws also be binding?

But, dismissing the Judaical predilections of certain Christians in our times, let us see what is the real points of difference between the true method of observing the Lord's day, and the ultraism against which we protest. The first question we shall answer is this: "Is it lawful to cook on Sunday, to employ servants on that day for cooking, or for any other work necessarily connected with it, as kindling a fire, fetching water, &c.?" *Answer.* It is, unquestionably, lawful. Not only is there no violation of the Sunday in these acts, but it would be paying a superstitious and anti-christian respect to the Jewish law, to abstain from cooking on Sundays on scriptural grounds. The reason of this decision is obvious. The law of Moses does not bind the professors of Christianity, and the Christian church never forbade necessary work on Sunday, as is plain from the universal practice of the Christian world, before the rise of puritanism. The same thing is also attested by all the councils and theologians anterior to this modern revival of Judaism. The most rigid decisions regarding the observance of Sunday, invariably except the work that is required for dressing food; and this is the principal difference between the observance of the ancient Sabbath and that of the Lord's day. It may be said, too, that Sunday being a day of thanksgiving and holy joy, there is not only no obligation of

eating cold meats on that day, but it would be at variance with the spirit of the church to do so, and at one time it was strictly forbidden to fast on Sunday. The sixty-fifth canon of those called apostolic, says, "If any one be convicted of fasting on Sunday, let him be deposed; if he be a layman, let him be excommunicated." A council of Carthage (iv, c. 64) speaks thus: "Let him who purposely fasts on Sunday be not considered as a Catholic." This constant tradition of the church is found in many passages of the canon law.

2. "Is it lawful to study, read, or apply to any mental occupation on the Lord's day?" The "convention," which abstained from saying any thing on the first question, probably through fear of some stiff-necked opponents, decides the second without the slightest apprehension.

"Nor is this interval of repose, as a law of our physical nature, less necessary to *intellectual* occupations. The mind must be statedly unladen of its cares, as the body of its burdens, or a similar penalty must be endured. The ordinary effects of systematic violations of the Lord's day, by men of business or professional men, are less clearness of perception and power of discrimination, and soundness of judgment, and generally by a diminution of intellectual vigor, often followed by a sudden breaking down of the overtasked mental faculties; in other instances, the result is lunacy or self-murder. In short, moral and religious considerations apart, nothing is gained by a violation of the divine command—a truth often learned too late. If a man would make the most of himself in all respects, he will do well to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy."

We do not think it ourselves, but we have no doubt that there are many who would be led to coincide in the views of this resolution, by the very fact that so many reverend gentlemen could sit quietly in the convention without protesting against such a silly doctrine. It would almost be supposed that these gentlemen, from having studied the Bible so assiduously on Sunday, experienced a sudden breaking down of all their mental faculties, and that some, perhaps, would be visited in the end with nothing short of lunacy. The doctrine of the convention, that study is forbidden on Sundays, is not, however, in keeping with their other principles; for, as they quote the law of Moses as an authority, they should have adduced some passage declaring that mental application is prohibited, and then we should have been left to the conclusion that a Jew had no other alternative on the Sabbath than to sleep; for if the law forbidding manual labor, forbade intellectual occupations also, as going to church was not obligatory, and was oftentimes impracticable, it follows that he had no other resource than to sleep the whole day. The true Christian doctrine on this subject is this. It is agreed among divines, that the obligation of resting on Sunday extends only to *servile works*, that is, to the mechanical arts or trades, embracing the usual forms of dealing and legal proceedings. But they also unanimously teach that the *liberal* arts, such as study, reading, writing, and the like, are by no means forbidden on Sunday. Hence, in all Christian countries, a student who would refuse to spend a small portion of his time in study on Sunday, would furnish a much stronger proof of his laziness, than of his respect for the law of God. It may, perhaps, be objected that study withdraws the attention as much from the worship of God as servile works do. We grant this; or, to speak more properly, servile work and more liberal occupation are both indifferent in themselves, and can be equally directed to the honor and glory of God, by the pious Christian, and this on Sunday as well as on any other day of the week. But the church has forbidden servile work on Sunday, and not other pursuits, and therefore the former only are prohibited, and not the latter. In suspending bodily labor and the exercise of the mechanical arts on Sunday, the church wished to exhibit a sign of joy, to afford a respite to the poorer class of society, who are chiefly employed in those occupations, and to remove even from the humbler walks of life the danger of neglecting the duties of religion, under the pretext of necessary labor. These are the reasons which led to the prohibition of servile work, but they do not apply to other avocations; and were we even ignorant of the motives on which the distinction is founded, it is enough for us to know that the law forbids servile work, and no other kind of work. If a mechanic wishes to read a historical book on Sunday, he can do it without sin; but he would commit a sin by working at his trade, because the church, for very wise reasons, forbids the one, and does not forbid the other. It is true that if

Christians were strictly commanded to employ the twenty-four hours of Sunday in religious exercises, then liberal, as well as servile work, would be forbidden; but far from there being any obligation of spending the twenty-four hours of Sunday in religious exercises, we think it is altogether impossible to do so. The "convention" grounded their decision, as quoted above, on the fact that persons who apply to intellectual labor stand in need of rest, as well as others. We are perfectly aware of this, and it is partly for this reason that we wonder at their selection of Sunday as a day of rest, as if the meditation of the law of God, and listening to discourses, were not an intellectual occupation. It is a general usage for schools to suspend their exercises on other days during the year besides Sundays.

3. "Is it forbidden to recreate one's self on Sunday by means of conversation, or some innocent amusement?" On this point it is natural to expect that the language of the convention would be formal and positive. It accordingly represents all kinds of play and enjoyment as strictly forbidden on Sunday, which it declares to be "a day of rest from secular business, travelling, and amusement." In the book before us, for the instruction of young men, amusement on Sundays is represented as a most serious offence. The following is a specimen of the doctrine contained in this manual of juvenile piety.

"On a Sabbath day, two sons of a poor widow went to slide on some ice at a short distance from home. . . . In a little time the ice gave way, and, awful to relate, clasped in each others arms, they sunk to rise no more. Thus were these two youthful Sabbath breakers called to stand before the judgment seat of that Almighty Being who has said: 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Again: "On a Lord's day, at the time of the great frost in the year 1634, fourteen young men were playing at foot-ball, on the river Trent, near Gainsborough; while thus engaged in the open violation of God's command, they met together in a scuffle, the ice suddenly broke, and they were all drowned!"

Thus is every kind of recreation on Sunday represented as an open violation of the law of God. But where is the proof of this assertion? Recreation is not an evil in itself; it is one of the wants of human nature, and may be sanctified as well as eating and drinking, by prayer and a pure intention. If recreation then is sinful on Sundays, it must arise from the prohibition of some law: but we assert most confidently that there is no such law. The law of Moses has not a word on the subject; it forbids *working* on Sunday; but amusement, far from being work, is the very reverse of it. To say that the law of Moses forbade recreation, is just as unfounded as to assert that it forbade eating and sleeping on the Sabbath. Had the Almighty intended to prohibit all amusement on the Sabbath, his command would have been conveyed in express terms; for the Jews, a carnal people, would not have been much influenced by a slight intimation. They seem, moreover, to have understood the law according to our interpretation, and many authors affirm that they considered the Sabbath as a day of enjoyment and recreation. This view is evidently confirmed by the following words of St. Austin: "It would be better for a Jew to do something useful in his field, than to raise mobs in the theatre; and their women would do better to spin wool on the Sabbath, than to dance immodestly all day at their new moons."* Some Puritan divines refer to the 58th chapter, 13th verse of Isaiah, to show that recreation is forbidden on the Sabbath. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord honorable, and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking words." The Doway Bible has the word *will* instead of *pleasure*. But the sense is the same. This passage indicates that travelling was forbidden to the Jews on their Sabbath, and it cautions them against doing their own will or pleasure on that day, that is, against preferring their own will or pleasure to the will of God. But it says nothing about recreations, properly so called, as will appear from the following remarks. The Scripture here says that the Jews should not speak *words* on their Sabbath, which undoubtedly means improper words, otherwise talking itself would be forbidden on Sunday, a degree of perfection which even puritanical zeal has not yet thought of, and which few would be willing to practise as a matter of obligation. In like manner the *will* or *pleasure* which the Jews were forbidden to indulge on the Sabbath was a *disorderly* will or pleasure. But

* De decem. chor. c. 3.

there is not a shadow of disorder in mere recreation; no more than in eating or drinking. It follows from all this that we have no evidence of the law of Moses forbidding amusements on the Sabbath. But, whether it did or not, that law is now abolished. The gospel is equally silent on the subject, and, as to the Christian church, it does not forbid moderate recreation on Sundays any more than sleeping, eating, drinking, conversing, and walking, which are not servile works. The most regular and exemplary religious communities enjoy their usual recreation on Sundays, as on other days, and even a little more on Sundays, because it is a day of joy and thanksgiving. It must be observed that on this point the convention was betrayed into a palpable contradiction, no doubt on account of the different views of those who framed the resolutions. It tells us that Sunday is a day of rest absolutely necessary to the laborer and to those engaged in intellectual pursuits, and that without this their vigor and health are doomed to certain destruction. It states

"That the Sabbath is peculiarly the friend of the laborer, and comes, an angel of mercy, to give him rest from his toils."

After this declaration we should imagine that laborers have nothing more to do on Sunday than to rest from their work, to enjoy themselves, and pass a day very similar to that of our annual thanksgiving. But in this we are mistaken; the views of the "Sabbath" men are quite different. The rest which they accord to the laborer on Sunday consists in rising early, singing psalms, or reading the Bible, eating cold victuals, observing silence, not walking out, and wearing a solemn and demure countenance during the whole day. If this be rest, it is a sort of rest which few persons would relish. We venture to assert that many would prefer working every day in the week, than to enjoy such repose as this on the *seventh*.

We are far from saying that the whole Sunday may be spent in amusement and recreations, so as to convert the day into one of public dissipation and revelry. In former times the Roman emperors were directed to prohibit public games on Sundays, as we learn from the decrees of Theodosius and others. Leo and Anthemius published the following law: "Not to infringe the rest of that holy day, we do not suffer any one to indulge in obscene pleasures. Let this day witness no theatrical representations, no combats of the circus, no doleful exhibitions of wild beasts."* These games were immoral and occupied a very long time: but there is no law prohibiting on Sunday a rational and moderate amusement, as all divines teach. It may be asked whether playing cards on Sunday is immoral. The question is suggested to our mind by the circumstance of having heard the opinion expressed, that to play cards on Sunday is one of the most heinous sins that can be committed. We answer that to play at cards, as many do, making use of profane and blasphemous language, betting money which justice or charity forbids us to squander, in bad company or in disreputable haunts, to play cards in any one of these ways is criminal, not only on Sunday but on every day of the week. But to play at cards without any of those circumstances which tend to immorality, is not more sinful on Sundays than other days, and implies nothing more unlawful than a conversation or a simple amusement would be.

4. "Is travelling altogether forbidden on Sunday?" In replying to this question it is needless to state the sentiment of the convention. It will be readily supposed that it denounced travelling on the "Sabbath" as a manifest desecration of the day, and as an open violation of God's commands. A large portion of the time devoted to the proceedings was consumed in discussions relative to the suspension of every kind of motion on Sunday; boats, cars, ships, stages, horses, nothing was excepted; and we would almost infer, judging from the zeal and earnestness of the members, that they would have resolved to stop the flight of birds and the daily revolution of the earth on its axis, if these objects had appeared to them practicable. Those who view the question without prejudice will not find it difficult to admit the following explanations. Travelling was indeed forbidden by the law of Moses on the Sabbath; but this law is not obligatory among Christians. A milder way of observing the Lord's day has been adopted by the church, as we have repeatedly stated and demonstrated. Hence to know whether travelling is forbidden on Sundays we are not to consult the Old Testament, but the sense and practice of the Christian church. This point

* Cod. L. 3, tit. 12.

however, being one of discipline, may not always have been observed in precisely the same manner: and in particular localities, or at particular times, travelling on Sunday may have been prohibited; but it is not at the present time forbidden by the Christian church. She does not indeed advise her children to travel on that day; but she has issued no particular prohibition concerning it, and according to the general rule that servile works alone are forbidden, divines conclude that travelling is not forbidden because it is not a servile work. From this remark, however, we would except the travelling of *burden* cars and *freight* boats, when they start on Sunday, because an operation of this kind may justly be considered a servile work forbidden on that day. But the travel, once commenced, may be continued on Sunday, according to these divines, because the stoppage of a car or boat, laden with freight, might be attended with a serious inconvenience. Such are the views of those who view the observance of Sunday in a Christian light, and not through the medium of Judaism. We, therefore, infer that to aim at stopping the mail on Sunday, under the pretext of any divine command to that effect, is sovereignly ridiculous, and we trust that the people of the U. States will never suffer themselves to be imposed upon by such fanatical ultraism in relation to the observance of the Lord's day. Even were the conveyance of the mail the most servile of all works, there would be a reason of public utility and necessity for continuing it on Sundays, and it would be perfectly justifiable. The Founder of the Christian religion, through motives of utility, selected the Sabbath for the performance of miracles, despite the murmurs of the Pharisees, who accused him of breaking the day of rest. These considerations also prove that it is by no means sinful to run passenger cars, boats, or coaches on Sunday. The great utility and even necessity of these arrangements amply compensate for the apparent servility that attaches to the work. No one is commanded or exhorted to travel on Sunday; but there may be and very often there are circumstances which render travelling on Sunday a proper and even a virtuous action. Public utility, therefore, requires that the necessary facilities for this should not be wanting. Suppose an individual in Baltimore were informed on Saturday evening that a beloved parent lay dangerously ill in Philadelphia; should he be deprived of the means of going thither on Sunday, merely because the travel does not suit the unfounded views of certain religionists? They who reside on the route between Washington and Baltimore enjoy the advantage of attending divine worship on Sunday in either city, if the cars run on that day, but not otherwise. These are indeed reasons of necessity; but as travelling is not strictly forbidden on the Lord's day, if the cars run between Washington and our city, we may go to the former place on Sunday for the purpose of visiting a friend, and still have time enough to attend worship, while the leisure enjoyed in the cars affords an excellent opportunity of reading and meditation. There is nothing in all this but what reason applauds, and those who condemn it may be justly charged with affected rigorism or pitiable ignorance. If it be said that the directors of the travelling conveyances are in this way prevented from observing the Lord's day, we answer that many individuals, for instance, the sick, are no better provided for in this respect. If the directors or conductors of rail road cars, &c., can attend divine worship on Sunday, they ought to do so; but if they can not, as they are engaged in a lawful occupation, they are no more obliged to go to church than persons at sea. And they would do well to remember that, under such circumstances, if they fulfil the other precepts of religion, they may please God as much as their brethren.

We do not intend to enter any further into the casuistry of this question; but we can not dismiss the subject without a brief allusion to a point not always properly understood. Is a Christian bound to devote his whole time on Sunday to religious exercises? This is a point of great importance and on which the solution of many other cases depends; for, if we are obliged to spend the whole day in praying, reading the Bible, and singing psalms, as some believe, then it is a plain case that cooking, walking, talking, &c., are desecrations of the Lord's day. This question, however, has already been answered in the preceding remarks, and we speak of it merely for the purpose of corroborating what has been already said, by the inconsistency and ultraism of Sabbath zealots. How do they prove the obligation of

spending the whole day in religious exercises? If they have recourse to the ritual of the old law, as they do for questions of this kind, we have already shown that the law of Moses did not prescribe any thing on the Sabbath, except resting from work in honor of the creation or the rest of God after the work of six days. It is true that the law very frequently speaks of the Sabbath as holy to the Lord, and as a day to be sanctified; but these words signify nothing more than a consecration of the day to God by resting from work according to his command. In some parts of Scripture the Jews are also directed to meditate on the law of God, to wear it on their garments; but it is worthy of remark that all this bears no more reference to the Sabbath than to any other day of the week. Moreover, the command to sanctify the Sabbath, if supposed to imply something internal, may be restricted to that general consecration of our actions to God which takes place when, being lawful in themselves, they are directed to him by Christian motives. In this way a conversation on family concerns or on scientific subjects may be offered to God; in fact, if the only means of sanctifying our time was to spend it in religious exercises, most of it would be lost. The Christian religion calls every day in the week *feria* or holyday, because it is the duty of the true Christian to sanctify every day in the week, and not one only of the seven. The Sabbath may have been sanctified by the Jews in this way by offering their rest to God, without a strict obligation of spending the whole day in prayer, an obligation which, for carnal men as they were, would have been a very heavy yoke. When the evangelist St. John played with a dove, as is related by historians, he did not pretend to rob his Master of the few moments during which he indulged in this necessary and reasonable relaxation; neither does the idea of sanctifying the Sabbath necessarily imply the obligation of spending the whole day in prayer. If such were the law in relation to the Lord's day, its observance would be manifestly impossible to children and young persons, and also to the mass of the people, who are the whole week employed in mechanical occupations. To require a youth to spend the twenty-four hours or even the twelve hours of Sunday in prayer, meditation, and the singing of psalms, would be almost a moral impossibility; and, if it were enforced, the Sunday would be the most tiresome day in the week. This we have learned from persons who, having been trained to a puritanical mode of keeping the Lord's day, were allowed only to read the Bible and go to church. Laborers and mechanics, after the fatigues of the week, can not enter into so contemplative a mood on Sunday as to spend the whole of their time in religious exercises, without any conversation or other diversion. The tenets of certain zealots on this point are at variance with the strongest impulses of our nature. They may very well suit those who believe that man is under the necessity of committing sin, that all our actions are sinful, and that God commands things which are impossible to man, but they will never do for those who abhor these doctrines as blasphemous and demoralizing.

The Catholic church has learned, from the practice and the tradition of the apostles, that to assist at the holy sacrifice of the new law, called in the Acts "the breaking of bread," is the great means of sanctifying the Lord's day. She accordingly enjoins this duty very rigorously, and admits no cause of exemption except that which is founded on grave reasons. She, moreover, exhorts the faithful to assist at the evening service, called vespers, though she does not require it so rigorously as a compliance with the morning duty. She invites them also on that day to hear religious instructions, to receive the sacraments, to read good books, &c. She further obliges her children to abstain from servile work, that no one may derive from his worldly concerns a pretext for not assisting at divine worship, or neglecting other religious duties, and also that they may participate, at least externally, in the joy of Christ's resurrection. But at the same time she urges the faithful to sanctify all the days of the week, by carefully abstaining from sin, and by offering to God, in a truly Christian spirit, those ordinary actions which they perform in submission to the order of his providence.

Thus does she point out to them the way to heaven, avoiding with equal solicitude that laxity of principle which would lead men to believe that they may freely indulge themselves during the week, provided they keep the Sunday, and that hypocritical ultraism which would convert a day of joy and repose into a period of gloom and unrest.

THE MOTHER'S LAMENT.

BY CHARLES F. KEENAN.

INSCRIBED TO MY SISTER.

My child, my beautiful, and art thou gone,
Faded for ever from thy mother's sight,
Leaving her in her desolation lone,
Changing to gloom, to bitterest gloom, the light
Wherein her spirit revelled? Now the night
Shall be for her the night that knows no morn,
And in its long, long course, with sternest might,
Shall sorrows come upon her; for uptorn
Are now the loveliest hopes that in this heart were born.

Ah! man may talk of sorrow, when his heart
Broods, like the captive in his dungeon cell,
Over the ruin of his hopes—and start,
When thought is frenzy, which alone can tell,
In maniac eloquence, why reason fell,
And what the weight of anguish that oppressed—
How hard it is to bid a last farewell
To fame, the goal to which his spirit pressed,
And all the glorious dreams which fancy erst caressed.

But woman's heart is stronger; it was made
For harsher trials, and it will not break.
She droops beneath her sorrows' length'ning shade,
Hushing the throbbing pulse, the rising shriek;
Struggling with misery, which fain would wreak
Its vengeance on her; while proud man, her guide,
Deems but the half-seen struggle, fancy's freak;
Man sees not woman's heart, and, in his pride,
Records upon her tomb: "She lived, she loved, she died."

Brief history, and vain—an airy swell—
The record of man's ignorance. The stroke,
The agony which reason could not quell,
Which all the fountains of affection broke,
And bade their waters forth,—these might provoke
An angel-mind to madness. Ye saw not
How, like the mountain tempest-stricken oak,
She struggled with her weakness, and begot
An energy which shames her lord's superior lot.

And thou art gone, my child! I almost bless
The day death tore thee from thy mother's arms;
And though I ever miss the dear caress,
The kiss I gave thee, ere thy infant charms
Passed from my sight, yet still my bosom warms,
Whene'er I view thee, 'mid the cherub-band,
For ever severed from this world's alarms,
Chanting the anthems of the spirit land,
Which ever swell from groups that round the Almighty stand.

Yet thou wert lovely to thy mother's eye,
And it was hard to give thee to the grave;
And she stood by, and, tearless, saw thee die,
Who would have given all, e'en life, to save;
Yet, with a mother's heart, she dared to brave
The maddening horrors of that baleful hour,
Until she saw thee sink, and the dull wave
Of death close over thee, with resistless power;
Thy death was as the death of spring's first, loveliest flower.

And what is there of earth that now may bind,
With cherished tie, my spirit to the things
Which here glad other hearts? How can I find,
Amid the desert, one bright bird that sings
A song of hope to grief,—a fount that springs,
And pours its coolness o'er the dreary wild
Of my poor heart;—ah! there is nought that brings
A solace to my woes. Earth seems defiled,
Since thou art gone, my own, my beautiful, my child!

THE STUDENT OF BLENHEIM FOREST,

OR THE TRIALS OF A CONVERT.

BY MRS. ANNA H. DORSEY.

Continued from p. 196.

CHAPTER X.

Trials.

COLONEL Clavering looking up, and seeing his wife standing before him, angrily inquired: "Why do *you* come hither—to mock me, to triumph, or to congratulate me on my son's conversion to popery?"

"Ah! neither; none of these unkind offices have I come to fulfil, but to share the grief which"——

"Stop, madam—no further—for, on my honor as a gentleman, I can bear any thing but double dealing. You would console me as a thief would his friend, from whom he had stolen his greatest treasure! Excuse hard words, madam; for this day a blow has descended on my heart, which has bruised it sorely. Tell me," he continued, seizing her hand, and speaking sharply, "is *madness* inherent in your family; I could bear that; tell me?"

"Madness!" asked Mrs. Clavering, in much alarm; "alas! no; you look ill, my husband; here, lean on me, and go to your apartment and lie down."

"No, I am not ill," he replied, holding himself up proudly and erect, and throwing back the almost white hair which hung in disorder over his forehead and temples; "not ill, madam. I have only been plucking bitter fruits, that have sprung from a seed which I was once mad enough to plant in my heart of hearts; it grew and ripened; it blossomed, and the leaves fell, and its fruits are *bitter, bitter.*" Mrs. Clavering wept. "To you, madam, I ought to render up my thanks, for blighting the hopes that have strengthened with my age, for infusing the poison of your idolatrous sentiments into the heart of the heir of my name and fortune, making him first a mad theorist, then a dull student, and now—out upon the word—a papist! Well might he, with such a show of words, refuse the hand of Isadora when *he* knew, and *you* knew—for,

doubtless, your secret conferences have been many—that I would sooner have laid her on her last pillow than on the bosom of a papist. I suppose you will next want a mass-house put up, and one of your whining priests engaged to perform his senseless ceremonies?"

"Colonel Clavering," said the lady, rising calmly, and with dignity, "reproaches I can bear, for your heart is full. I pity you; but insults!—forbear to insult me!"

"True, madam, true," he answered, bowing, "a gentleman never insults a woman. I will only say that, if you have any such notions as these, I beg you will wait until I am dead before they are put into execution; and then you and Lou—— my —— but what is this?" said he, passing his hand several times over his forehead, and gulping down tears which the rising and terrible emotions of his heart were sending forth; "I was going to say if you and the —— and your —— oh, my God! vain is the effort. I loved him too well! My idol is stricken down. David! David! where is thy Absalom? Josephine, leave me; for ever, if you will. I am a heart-broken old man, and must weep; leave me, and send my slave to me, he who has been my friend from childhood; surely—surely I can trust *him*."

Mrs. Clavering thinking it best to humor the extravagance of his grief for a season at least, left him, and despatched her maid after Albert, the colonel's servant, and retired to her room, happy to kneel and acknowledge, with an humble and subdued heart, the chastisements of that heaven she had so long insulted, by a pusillanimous relinquishment of the consolations and privileges of her religion—a religion wherein all things necessary to salvation are fulfilled—on whose breast the martyred saints rest in peace and light ineffable, and the beatified everlastingly shine like jewels of sapphire and diamonds; where, from the cradle to the grave, onward and *upward* steps are planted, the last link of which hangs on to heaven for the soul to tread; and to him who fainteth not in the narrow ascent, angelic guards are given to aid and support him until the last step is made to perfection. The colonel, with his man, retired to one of a suite of rooms which were usually reserved for company, where he determined to devote a few hours to solitude and grief, and the remainder of the night to the adjustment of certain plans relative to the incidents of the last few hours. Old Albert's intellect was rather obtuse, affection for his master being the most exalted idea he was capable of; but he discovered that something unusual had occurred to distress and afflict him, and with instinctive, though uncultivated delicacy, he proceeded to show, in a thousand nameless attentions, his respectful sympathy. He soon caused every thing in the chilled and forsaken apartment to look comfortable, as he rapidly kindled a fire of huge hickory logs, on the hearth, which soon blazing with ruddy glare, illuminated every recess with its cheerful beams. He drew up a table before the genial blaze, and going out, returned with lights, his master's writing implements, and tea and toast, the only articles of food he ever tasted at night. The colonel was so accustomed to seeing Albert move about him, that he did not particularly observe him, until the latter, finding that nothing else was to be done, stood at a respectful distance looking, with an anxious and troubled expression, in his master's face. Now the very cessation of the sound of footsteps, and the departure of his moving shadow and large black hands, that seemed as if they could never arrange properly the objects on the table beside him, caused him to look up.

"Thank'e, Albert—thank'e, my boy," he said, observing, for the first time, the thoughtful old negro; "I shall not want you any longer this evening. I am perplexed—worried with business. Go now, my man, and say to your mistress that I shall remain here to-night, as I have writing to do; you can say, too, that I do not wish to be interrupted." Albert delivered the message to Mrs. Clavering, and, after giving orders to every body in the house to keep quiet, as his "mass' colonel had some werry important bisness to transact, and didn't want to be disrupted," returned to take his stand near his master's room-door, that he might be prepared, like a faithful sentinel, to attend his commands on the slightest notice. Here he watched until night wore on, and the hours glided by, and he heard the last footsteps of the retiring domestics, and the final closing up of doors and windows. He felt lonely in that long dark passage, and began to think of Obi and all his frightful train of spectres. Now came the wind sighing mournfully past, shaking with fitful and tremulous motion the branches of a tree against a win-

dow near him, anon the house dogs howled, disturbed by the wind or a falling leaf, and slept again, and again roused up and whined piteously, then crept back uneasily to their kennels; he began, too, to hear heavy groans, and broken sentences, and rapid footsteps in his master's room; and now, at the upper extremity of the passage, he saw—yes, certainly, a light glimmering on towards him; with eyes strained and starting, and uplifted hands, the old negro gazed in terror, until he saw that a being, pale and solemn, bore the light; then, with a loud cry, he bounded against Col. Clavering's door, and besought him to open it. It was promptly and hastily opened, and Albert fell, or rather rolled in at his master's feet, having in his fright mistaken Louis, who had been spending some hours in the oratory, for Obi. The colonel was touched when he found for what purpose his servant had stationed himself at his door, and after gently chiding him for his cowardice, made him lie down on a chamber sofa, and taking down a cloak of his own, which happened to be hanging in the room, threw it over the abashed and terrified slave. "Lie down, Albert—lie down, sir. Come, you know I will be obeyed, if I should command you to spend the remainder of the night in this bedstead instead of the sofa you are on— so be quiet!" Alarmed at the idea of being put in the lofty and elegant bedstead, he quickly settled himself, and, drawing his knees up to his chin, his deep, sonorous breathings, ere long, gave evidence that his repose was welcome and sweet, after his unusual vigils.

The morning sun rose, clear and beautiful, on the earth, shining down, in calm and triumphant glory, as if no shadows ever fell over the hearts of those he beamed upon. But in one spot, one beauteous spot, where the diamond hues of his light were ever enshrined in exquisite setting of lovely foliage or flowers dripping with dew, or filagree frost-work, wrapped in fantastic traceries around the evergreens, in this bright spot there were hearts heavily laden and stricken. Colonel Clavering had written a few lines to his lady, requesting herself and son, with Isadora, to meet him after breakfast in the family drawing-room, and directed Albert to lay the note on Mrs. Clavering's plate. She had seen her son the preceding night, and heard from him all the details of the painful scene that had occurred between his father and himself, and, now that the crisis had come, she determined, with God's aid, to be true to herself, and, without shrinking from the storm that lowered over her head, stand boldly forth and declare herself unalterably, and unequivocally, a Roman Catholic. There was a sad group in that drawing-room. Mrs. Clavering, in her accustomed place, sat gazing thoughtfully on her son, who stood leaning on the mantel-piece, in silent and painful meditation. Isadora was sitting at the centre table, looking with pretended interest over some small books that lay on it, and brushing off, furtively, tear after tear, as they filled her eyes and wet her heavy silken eye-lashes. The colonel soon entered, and bowed, with polite and distant dignity, to his lady, and now approached Isadora, and, drawing a chair up to the table by her, kissed her on the forehead as he seated himself, calling her by the endearing name of "my child," and addressed her in the kindest and most tender manner. He opened a small package which he had brought with him, and drew forth several papers which were closely written, and spread them on the table in the calmest and most business-like manner possible, and when every thing was arranged to his satisfaction, he said, quietly turning to his son: "I have been trying most earnestly to think that the occurrences of the last few hours are the effects of distempered imagination; I *did* feel ill for a short time; that passed off; but this meeting, and the gloomy faces I see around me, stamp it all with reality."

"Yes, sir,—reality," answered the young student, firmly.

"Well, reality if you will. I have concluded, however, to make a last effort to save and redeem you from the slavery and bondage under which it seems you have placed yourself." Clavering bowed without speaking, and his father continued: "I will not attempt polemics; you are a better theologian than I, and more deeply versed in such matters, and would anticipate all I might say. As to your wanderings into the mazes of popery, they amaze, they confound me; but I fondly flatter myself that you have fallen to rise again more than ever confirmed in the religion of your fathers."

"My respected father," interrupted Clavering,———

"Nay—nay, sir; hear me out," said the colonel; "I have a proposition to make you which I trust—I am sure, you will accede to. In a few days I expect Bishop M—— here for a short time, on his way to the south for the winter. As you know well, he is a profound theologian, and a man eminently qualified by his piety and gentlemanly manners to remove by his influence and learned arguments all those false notions which you, like a German visionary, have taken up. I wish you to travel one year with him; give him fair opportunities of discussing this question with you, and if at the expiration of that time you are convinced of your error, and return to the fold of that church which you are so madly leaving, here is a deed which I will place in your hands, when you return, consigning to your sole control one hundred thousand dollars, one of my richest plantations, and several valuable slaves, with my unqualified consent to marry the object of your choice, whoever she may be; but if on the contrary you refuse to accede to these my propositions, it is my will that you leave my presence at once and for ever, *never to return;* for never shall I wish again to see your face over the threshold of my house—never. Consider well, young man; this is a serious matter." Clavering closed his eyes and grew deadly pale; he trembled and was compelled to sit down; he looked at his mother and saw her countenance writhing with anguish, and felt at once the full extent of the misery and loneliness he was bringing on the once happy home. Isadora too bowed her head and listened with strained ears to hear his decision, feeling but too keenly that she was in some way to assist at the sacrifice.

"Father," he at last said slowly and emphatically, "I thank you most earnestly for your kind and considerate offers. Allow me to declare to you that my affection, my obedience, my duty, are in a double measure yours. I am ready, if it were necessary, to lay down my life for you, so grateful am I for all your past care and kindness, and, last of all, for the splendid offers which you have in all good conscience and faith made me. It would be useless, indeed folly, for me to place myself under the theological guidance of Bishop M—— now, when, for several years past, I have been studying with persevering and untiring assiduity the very course of theology which he himself directed, and, with all due deference to his intelligence, piety, his simple and unostentatious manners and gentlemanly and dignified bearing, I profess myself, without the least arrogance, fully qualified to anticipate and triumphantly refute every argument that he could advance against the tenets of the Roman Catholic church. I must, therefore, my dear father, after thanking you again and again most humbly for your kindness, decline these offers, and, with a conscience at peace with Almighty God, though a sorely wounded heart, I am ready to go forth from my home, penniless and friendless, rather than make the slightest compromise with the religious doctrines which I have with good reason forsaken."

"It is well, sir," replied Colonel Clavering, calmly; "your decision is made?"

"*It is, sir.*"

"Reflect calmly and dispassionately, young man; there is yet time. Can you give up all and bring the gray hairs of your parents in sorrow to the grave—strew thorns in their pathway—shed gloom and wo around their forsaken hearts? Think well, Louis," said Col. Clavering.

"I have counted the costs, sir," his son answered; "I give up all. The splendor of earth's riches or the love of devoted parents or sincere friends could not accomplish my salvation; neither could they redeem my soul if lost; therefore I reject all, leave all—parents, friends, wealth, standing, reputation, and luxuries, and embrace, for the sake of Christ and his truth, the most humbling confusion, which will win for me after death peace—which will raise me from dishonor to honor, from mortality to immortality. Yes, my decision is made."

"Sir," said Mrs. Clavering to her husband, unable any longer to bear the harrowing scene, and rising in great emotion,—"can you thus cast from your heart and home your only child, and heap maledictions on his head because he sees fit and finds it necessary to his salvation to change his creed? By what right is this done? After death, should he fail in this essential act, a partial parent will not be his judge or his protection, but a stern and awful God—a jealous God. Why this untiring hatred to the name of Catholic? You surely forget that you once looked on them with sufficient good faith to choose the wife of your heart from among the most pious and practical of that faith."

"Woman, silence!" exclaimed Colonel Clavering: "prate not to me of faith or religion or creed! I might respect your words if you had ever in the slightest manner evinced any consistency in your conduct respecting your religion. You might, madam, at least have caused me to respect, although I never could have believed it; but instead of this—instead of clinging to it as that which was to save your soul—why, you shook it from you—you weighed interest and love in one scale and your faith in another, and, by heaven, so heavy was the worldly weight and so light your eternal concerns that the beam kicked the sky. Oh! out, out on such a religion which has so little inducement for its votaries as this."

"Alas!" cried Mrs. Clavering, weeping; "I deserve all you can say,—it is too, too true; but hereafter, so help me heaven and God, I hug it to my heart—I kneel at the feet of my forsaken religion, and, if contrition and penitence and the deepest remorse can restore me to her smile, I shall die yet with the sign of faith on my brow. Not only this, Colonel Clavering, although a weak love, yes a weak unworthy love, and, mayhap, regard for human opinion, made me conceal and keep silent my sentiments, I have never, never forgotten the church in which for generations my fathers have lived and died. I have always been a Catholic at heart, and now that it has come to this, I declare myself one, and am ready with my child to sacrifice every thing rather than live as I have lived, meanly and traitorously preferring bonds and slavery to freedom and peace."

The young student, with a flushed brow and faltering step, left the room.

"I doubt much, madam, if you would ever have uttered this tirade if your love for your son had not overbalanced every other consideration. He is worthy of you, madam. Now, my child, my only child," said Colonel Clavering, taking the hand of the weeping and almost fainting Isadora in his own, his lips quivering notwithstanding all his efforts to appear calm; "I have a few words for you: deceived by appearance and my own doting fondness for him on whom I once looked as the darling of my age—deceived by hopes which for years I had been building and painting with illusive hues, I wrung from you the secret of your preference for him, believing that it was returned ten-fold; but, my child, we are both forsaken, and you must cling to the poor childless old man! Here are papers which will put you in possession of"——

"My dear uncle," said she, rising with dignity and sweetness, and gently putting back his hand as he held some business-like documents towards her,—"excuse me—I can not receive them; I do not feel well, and if you and my dear aunt will excuse me I will retire to my apartment."

There was a cold pallid tint on her cheeks, and a trembling motion about her pale lips that plainly told of internal and soul-felt anguish. After she left the room, the colonel handed a small bundle to his lady and said: "As your son bears my name, I can not let him go into the world penniless; this bundle contains notes to the amount of eight or ten thousand dollars; give it to him. I shall remain in my room until he leaves this house, and recollect, madam, I am not to be disturbed."

"Oh, my God! my God!" exclaimed Mrs. Clavering, falling on her knees and clasping her hands; "humble me; do with me as thou wilt; but forsake me not; aid me by thy grace in this trial which has in it to my soul all the bitterness of death!"

The colonel turned as he was leaving the apartment, and looked for an instant on his wife; again made a step onward and faltered, while his face, sympathizing with the agony that was tugging at his heart strings, grew pale and red by turns. His wife, thinking she would make one more effort in behalf of her child, stretched out her arms towards him, and cried in a tone of piercing agony: "Save our child, for I tell you his days are numbered; send him not away in anger; if you do, you will never behold him again, I know it—oh! I know it. Recall your words, Colonel Clavering; send him if you will for a season—a year—two years—but say not for ever!" The colonel, unable to support his trembling frame any longer, fell heavily on a chair near which he stood, and would have become insensible if tears, those angels of the heart, had not gushed in torrents from his eyes. Mrs. Clavering was in an instant at his side pleading in a low broken voice for her child, and now came another—Isadora—to kneel at his feet, and, with her seraphic face, tearless but radiantly pale, and her large perfect eyes, shining with holy beams, raised to his, she prayed for him who had thrown eternal shadows over her heart.

Colonel Clavering became more calm, and he looked with a more relenting and softer expression on his lady, and gradually extended his hand towards her in token of peace. "I can not, Josephine, I can not forgive him! You have the instincts of nature and education to plead in extenuation of your error, but *he* has nothing."

"But, dear uncle, FATHER," whispered Isadora, "his health is failing rapidly; this harshness, while it drives your only son from your bosom, recalls him not from his error. The very chivalry of his nature, ever putting aside more holy incentives, will make him endure exile and death itself for the sake of what he deems a principle of right; persecution to a mind so exalted as his only gives it a fresh impetus towards the attainment of the object for which it has suffered. Then forbear, dear uncle; you love your child, ah! yes, well do I know that his perfect image is enshrined in the holiest recess of your heart; pluck it out, and wounds will fester there unto death."

"Enough, Josephine; enough, Isadora; he must leave my presence; I could not bear to look on that which has so fearfully wounded me! Bid him go and remain until at least I can accustom my heart to think on it—then return, but expect no more than the coldest politeness from me, nor do I ever wish any other than the most distant civility from him." He left the apartment, and Mrs. Clavering drew Isadora to her bosom and held her in a long embrace, bathing her face with tears as she lay like an infant on her breast, while the noble self-sacrificing girl or rather WOMAN now uttered words of consolation and peace, to her who should rather have poured the oil of hope and comfort into the shattered urn of her stricken heart. But so it is. Life is filled with stranger things than this! What is woman's love but a spirit of endurance and devotion next akin to that eternal inspiration which exalts man to the angelic state; forgiving and ready to sacrifice, feeling no hatred or anguish though the heart may be rudely pierced with an abiding anguish!

TO BE CONTINUED.

MEMOIRS OF THE LIFE AND TIMES OF THE MOST REV. JOHN CARROLL,

FIRST ARCHBISHOP OF BALTIMORE.

BY B. U. CAMPBELL.

Continued from Vol. III, page 802.

THE last number of these memoirs,* which gave the history of Rev. Mr. Carroll's appointment as superior of the Catholic clergy in this country, in 1784, contained also selections from his correspondence on the important topics which claimed his attention at that early period.

A visitation of the various congregations under his charge was necessary, not only to ascertain their actual condition, to correct any defects that might be found to exist, and to devise means for improvement, but also to impart to the faithful the blessings of confirmation, which sacrament, extraordinary as it may seem, had never, as yet, been administered within the limits of the thirteen United States of America.

After visiting some of the congregations in Maryland, he left home on the 22d of September, 1785, as he remarks in a letter to F. Plowden: "On a progress to administer confirmation at Philadelphia, New York, and in the upper counties of the Jerseys and Pennsylvania, where our worthy German brethren had formed congregations."

Some sketches of these congregations, and of their venerable founders, and their successors, may serve to enliven these pages; and, while thus preserved from oblivion, lead to a more extended and complete history, more worthy of the apostolical laborers in the

* December number, 1844.

infancy of the Catholic church in these states.

The following outline of the history of the Catholic missions in Pennsylvania, written by Bishop Carroll soon after his consecration in 1790, is copied from the original in his hand-writing.*

"About the year 1730, or rather later, Father Greaton, a Jesuit (for none but Jesuits had yet ventured into the English colonies), went from Maryland to Philadelphia, and laid the foundations of that congregation, now so flourishing; he lived there till about the year 1750, long before which he had succeeded in building the old chapel, which is still contiguous to the presbytery of that town, and in assembling a numerous congregation, which, at his first going thither, did not consist of more than ten or twelve persons. I remember to have seen this venerable man at the head of his flock in the year 1748. He was succeeded by the Rev. Father Harding, whose memory remains in great veneration, under whose patronage, and through whose exertions, the present church of St. Mary's was built.

"In the year 1741, two German Jesuits were sent to Pennsylvania for the instruction and conversion of German emigrants, who, from many parts of Germany, had come into that province. Under great hardships and poverty, they began their laborious undertaking, which has since been followed by great benedictions. Their names were Father Schneider, from Bavaria, and Father Wapeler, from the lower Rhine. They were both men of much learning and unbounded zeal. Mr. Schneider, moreover, was a person of great dexterity in business, consummate prudence, and undaunted magnanimity. Mr. Wapeler, having remained about eight years in America, and converted or reclaimed many to the faith of Christ, was forced by bad health to return to Europe. He was the person who made the first settlement at the place now called Conewago. Mr. Schneider formed many congregations in Pennsylvania, built, by his activity and exertions, a noble church at Goshenhoppen, and spread the faith of Christ far and near. He was used to visit Philadelphia once a month, for the sake of the Germans residing there, till it was at length found proper to establish there permanently a German priest as the companion of Father Harding. The person appointed was the venerable Father Farmer, who had come from Germany some years before, and had lived an apostolical life at Lancaster in the same province of Pennsylvania. This event took place, I believe, about the year 1760, or rather later. It is unnecessary to say much concerning the labors of this venerable servant of God; his memory is fresh in the minds of all, who knew or heard of him, having died in 1786, the model of pastors, and of all priests. The congregation of Philadelphia speaks sufficiently his praises; for it must be ascribed, in great measure, to him that so much piety and religion have been perpetuated in it.

"A short time before the death of this venerable servant of God, events took place in the United States of America, productive not only of a great political change in the state of the country, but likewise of the utmost importance to the Catholic religion.

"It is known that, in the year 1776, thirteen provinces of English America declared themselves independent of the British king and nation; and this independence, after a war of six years, was recognised by England. As long as the provinces, which, after the declaration of independence, assumed the title of states, were subject to the British, the Catholic religion had not penetrated into any but Maryland and Pennsylvania. The laws were most rigorous against the exercise of it; a priest was subject to death for only entering within their territories. Catholics were subject to the most rigorous penalties for adhering to the worship which their consciences approved, and were not only excluded from every office under government, but would hardly have been suffered to remain in any of the other provinces, if known to profess the faith of Rome. In this situation of things, few Catholics settled in other states, or, if they did, dissembled their religion, and either attached themselves to some other, or intermarried with Protestants, and suffered their children to be educated in error. Even in Maryland and Pennsylvania the condition of Catholics, as was noticed before, was a state of oppression.

* A translation into French of this paper was seen by Rev. Dr. Pise, who translated the greater portion of it into English, which was first published in the Metropolitan. The extract now made is from the original paper in Bishop Carroll's hand-writing.

The few Jesuits who could be spared from the English mission, were insufficient even to answer the exigencies of the two provinces in which they first settled; and no other clergymen undertook the perilous task of carrying the true faith into the other provinces. Such was the state of things when a general revolt from England took place.

"Having renounced subjection to England, the American states found it necessary to form new constitutions for their future government, and, happily, a free toleration of religions was made a fundamental point in all their new constitutions; and, in many of them, not only a toleration was decreed, but likewise a perfect equality of civil rights for persons of every Christian profession. In some, indeed, the yet unextinguished spirit of prejudice and intolerance excluded Catholics from this equality.

"Many reasons concurred to produce this happy and just article in the new constitutions. First, some of the leading characters in the direction of American councils were, by principle, averse to all religious oppression, and having been much acquainted with the manners and doctrines of Roman Catholics, represented strongly the injustice of excluding them from any civil right. Secondly, Catholics concurred, as generally and with equal zeal, in repelling that oppression which first produced the hostilities with Great Britain; and it would have been impolitic, as well as unjust, to deprive them of a common share of advantages, purchased with common danger and by united exertions. Thirdly, the assistance, or at least the neutrality of Canada, was deemed necessary to the success of the United States; and to give equal rights to Roman Catholics might tend to dispose the Canadians favorably towards the American cause. Lastly, France began to show a disposition to befriend the United States, and it was conceived to be very impolitic to disgust that powerful kingdom by unjust severities against the religion which it professed.

"Notwithstanding this happy change in the government and laws of the different states, still religion reaped little advantage from it before the close of the war. The priests were too few; many of them were worn down with age and hardships; besides which, during the whole war, there was not the least communication between the Catholics of America, and their bishop, who was the vicar apostolic of the London district. To his spiritual jurisdiction were subject the United States; but, whether he would hold no correspondence with a country which he, perhaps, considered as in a state of rebellion, or whether a natural indolence and irresolution restrained him, the fact is, he held no kind of intercourse with priest or layman in this part of his charge. Before the breaking out of the war, his predecessor had appointed a vicar, the Rev. Mr. Lewis, and he governed the mission of America during the bishop's silence.

"Soon after the termination of the war, the clergy, in Maryland and Pennsylvania, being sensible that, to derive all advantage from the new order of things in America, it would be proper to have an ecclesiastical superior in the country itself, and knowing the jealousy prevailing in the American governments against the right of jurisdiction vesting in a person residing in Great Britain, addressed themselves to the holy see, praying that a superior might be allowed, and that he might be chosen by the clergy, subject to the approbation and confirmation of his holiness. Soon after this petition was received at Rome, the present bishop was appointed superior, with very ample powers, and, amongst others, that of administering confirmation, a sacrament which had never yet been administered in the United States. This appointment was received in November, 1784.

"The new superior, soon after his appointment, drew up a state of religion in the country committed to his care, of which an abridgment is here annexed.

"The number of acknowledged Catholics in Maryland was estimated at about sixteen thousand, and most of them scattered in the country, employed in agriculture: in Pennsylvania, at more than seven thousand; and, as far as information could be obtained, about one thousand five hundred in the other states. But it has been discovered since that this estimate was much too low; the number of Catholics having been found much larger; and in this enumeration the Canadian French and their descendants are not comprehended, who inhabit the country lying to the westward of the Ohio and the borders of the Missisippi.

"The number of clergymen in Maryland

was nineteen, and five in Pennsylvania: of these, four through age and infirmity were almost entirely unfit for any service; and others were far advanced in years, and their constitutions were broken down with continual and long labors. Their subsistence was not drawn from the contributions of their flocks, excepting in some towns, as Philadelphia and Baltimore, but from the estates which were obtained at an early time by the first clergymen."

In addition to the above interesting statements of Bishop Carroll, the writer of these memoirs has collected from various sources the facts which follow.

It is uncertain at what period the holy sacrifice of the mass was first offered in Pennsylvania, and the name of the first priest who exercised his ministry there is unknown.

As early as 1686, Wm. Penn mentions "*the old priest*" in Philadelphia, and in 1708, in a letter from England to James Logan in Philadelphia, he says: "There is a complaint against your government that you suffer public mass in a scandalous manner. Pray send the matter of fact, for ill use is made of it against us here." Watson,* who furnishes these extracts from Penn's letters, says: "This early mentioned mass probably had its origin in the frame building on the north-west corner of Front and Walnut streets, which was the first chapel in Philadelphia." He also mentions a house at the south-east corner of Chesnut and and Second streets, which was said to have been built before 1736 "for a papal chapel, and that the people opposed its being so used in so public a place." He also states there was a Catholic chapel *near* the city of Philadelphia as early as 1729 *connected* with the house of a Miss Elizabeth McGawley, an Irish lady, who with a number of her tenantry settled on land on the road leading from Nicetown to Frankford; and he conjectures that it may have been there from the earliest origin of the city, and that such chapel was put there for Roman Catholics, because their religion, however agreeable to Penn's tolerant spirit, was not so to most Protestants then in power; since he had remarked in one of his letters from England to a correspondent in Philadelphia—"it has become a reproach to me here, with the officers of the crown, that you have suffered the scandal of mass to be publicly celebrated." To avoid such offence this chapel may have been at an inconvenient distance, and as if in secrecy.* Instead of the reason assigned by Mr. Watson, it is more probable that the chapel at Nicetown was erected by Miss McGawley about 1729, and "*connected* with her house" to enable the Catholics to attend divine service under the protection which was afforded by a private residence. Near the site of this ancient chapel, Watson remarks, "is a stone enclosure in which is a large tomb-stone of marble inscribed with a cross and the name, 'John Michael Brown, ob. 15 Decr. A. D. 1750, R. I. P.' This was a priest."† The testimony of Watson is conformable to the local tradition, although the inscription does not determine the priestly character of Brown. The miscreants who disgraced the name of native Americans were so convinced of the fact that they mutilated the stone during the riots of 1844.

In 1734, Governor Gordon informed the council that a house had been erected in Walnut street (probably at the north-west corner of Walnut and Front streets) for the *open* celebration of mass contrary to the statutes of William III. The minutes of the council, July, 1734, describe their proceedings thereupon as "the consideration of the council upon the building of the Roman mass house, and the public worship there."

The late Archbishop Neale, who had been pastor and vicar-general in Philadelphia in 1796, related the following tradition of the establishment of a Catholic priest in the city of Philadelphia. "The superior of the Jesuits in Maryland having been informed that there were many Catholics in the capital of Pennsylvania, resolved to endeavor to establish a mission there. The priest designed for this duty had an acquaintance in Lancaster of the name of Doyle, whom he visited, and requested to furnish him the name of some respectable Catholic in Philadelphia. Being referred to a wealthy old lady remarkable for her attachment to the ancient faith, he waited on her in the garb of a Quaker, and, after making inquiries about the various denominations of Christians in the city, asked first if there were any Catholics, and finally if she was one; to which she answered in the affirmative. He informed her that he also was of the same

* Annals of Philadelphia, first edition, p. 394, &c.

* Annals, p. 395. † Annals, p. 394, first edition.

communion. Being informed that the Catholics had no place of worship, he desired to know if they would wish to have a church. To which the lady replied, they would most certainly, but the great difficulty would be to find a clergyman; for, although there were priests in Maryland, it was impossible to procure one from thence. He then informed the lady that he was a priest, and of the intention of his visit. Overjoyed at the sight of a priest after many years' privation of that consolation, she communicated the intelligence to her Catholic acquaintance, and invited them to meet him at her house. A considerable number assembled, the most of whom were Germans. The priest explained to them the object of his visit, and a subscription was immediately commenced to procure the means to purchase ground and build a church. With the money raised they purchased the house and lot belonging to the lady, who also acted very generously in promoting the pious undertaking."

In the absence of dates and names it is presumed that the priest referred to in Archbishop Neale's statement was Rev. F. Greaton, who came to Philadelphia in 1730 and exercised his ministry first in the house at the north-west corner of Front and Walnut streets mentioned by Watson. In 1733 he purchased lots near Fourth street, between Walnut street and Willing's alley, and erected thereon a small chapel, called St. Joseph's, which was that referred to by Governor Gordon. Rev. Josiah Greaton was born about 1680, entered the Society of Jesus 5th July, 1708, and was professed in the same 4th of August, 1719. He was at St. Inigoes in Maryland in 1721 and 1724. After laboring assiduously in Philadelphia for about twenty years, he returned to Maryland, and died at Bohemia, on the eastern shore of the Chesapeake bay, on the 19th of September, 1753. F. Henry Neale, S. J., a native of Maryland, who arrived in America from Europe in 1740, and died in Philadelphia 1748, in the 46th year of his age, was also engaged on the Pennsylvania mission, certainly in 1746, and probably earlier.

The successor of F. Greaton was the Rev. Robert Harding, a native of England, who arrived in America in the year 1732. It is probable he went to reside in Philadelphia about the year 1750, but the writer has not been able to ascertain any particulars of his life previously. It is certain that he lived at least twenty years in that city, discharging the duties of pastor with exemplary fidelity and zeal.

The congregation of St. Joseph's having increased very much, it became necessary to purchase an additional lot for a burying-ground elsewhere, and in the year 1760 F. Harding succeeded in procuring lots between Fourth and Fifth streets, which were guaranteed to him and his heirs on condition of his building a church on a plan described in the instrument which conveyed these lots to him.

It was upon a part of these lots that F. Harding erected St. Mary's church in the year 1763; and he continued his zealous career to the close of his edifying life, which terminated at Philadelphia on the 1st of September, 1772, he being then in the seventy-first year of his age. Like the other missionaries of that period, his labors were not confined to the city of Philadelphia, but extended to places at a distance. There are records of baptisms performed by him in New Jersey.

It has been seen that missions were commenced at Conewago, and Goshenhoppen in Pennsylvania, in 1741. F. Wm. Wapeler, who made the first settlement, near the stream called Conewago, where the church of the Sacred Heart was afterwards erected, also purchased two lots in Lancaster in 1742; after laboring in Pennsylvania with great zeal, he returned to Europe with impaired health, and retired to Ghent and subsequently to Bruges, where he finished his course in 1781, in the seventieth year of his age. Before the return of Rev. Mr. Carroll to America, he became acquainted with Father Wapeler at Bruges, and in one of his letters to Father Plowden he expresses his admiration of the artless simplicity of this good missionary—and he bears testimony, in the above sketch, to his learning and piety.

Father Theodore Schneider is stated to be the first priest who came to Goshenhoppen, now in Berks county, about forty-five miles from Philadelphia, which he made his place of residence for more than twenty years. He at first boarded in a Catholic family, within two miles of the present church. In 1747 Father Henry Neale purchased one hundred and twenty-one acres of land at Goshenhoppen, for £250; and in the following year Father Greaton took up

three hundred and seventy-three acres from the proprietors of Pennsylvania, paying them fifty-one pounds. Those two tracts of land, containing together four hundred and ninety-four acres, became the missionary residence of Goshenhoppen,* in Berks county, which for nearly a century, has been devoted to the service of religion.

Whilst residing there, F. Schneider attended various other stations, to the distance of fifty miles from Goshenhoppen. He visited Philadelphia as early as 1741, and on 8th of Dec. of that year records a marriage there "*in sacello nostro.*" In 1744 he visited New Jersey, and held church at Iron Furnaces there. It is stated that he suffered persecution, and was several times shot at in New Jersey. But, having some skill in medicine, he cured many sick, and travelled under the name of *Doctor* Schneider; by which means he had access to places which he could not have visited without personal danger. In 1745, he built a church at Goshenhoppen, fifty-five by thirty-two feet, and tradition says he was assisted by all the neighbors, among whom were Menonists and Hernhutters, by all of whom he was respected and beloved. A relic of this venerable and zealous servant of God is preserved, which attests his patience and industry. It is a MS. copy of the entire Roman Missal, carefully and beautifully executed in his own hand-writing, and neatly bound. Poverty, or the difficulty of procuring such books from Europe at that time, probably induced the zealous missionary to snatch from his many labors occasional moments for the tedious work of transcribing a quarto volume of seven hundred printed pages, which was indispensable for his ministry.

After the most valuable services in the cause of religion for twenty-three years, he was visited in his last illness by Father Farmer, in June; and died the 10th of July, 1764, aged sixty-four years. In one of the catalogues S. J. he is thus mentioned: Th. Schneider, qui docuit Philos. et controv. Leodi, et fuit rector magnif. Universi. Heidelbergensis.

The missions in Pennsylvania, having been established by Jesuits from Maryland, continued to be supplied with clergymen from the same source; they were always under the jurisdiction of the superior of Maryland—who was himself appointed by and subject to the superior, or provincial of the English province, until the suppression of the Society of Jesus, in 1773.

In certain "ordinations and regulations for Maryland, April 2d, 1759," signed by Henry Corbie, who was provincial from 1756 to 1762, the following occur:

"As Maryland and Pennsylvania jointly constitute one college, or residence, the incumbents of each house or settlement, both in Maryland and Pennsylvania, are as many agents or procurators, to assist the superiors in the management of the whole, and for that end must faithfully give in their accounts of debt and credit to the said superior, once or twice a year, as opportunity shall serve to make his visit. An extract of these accounts must every year be sent to the provincial, to be according to custom, in due time, communicated to the general."

"As to conceal from the superior the real state of any house or settlement would savor of property, and be a manifest transgression of holy poverty, so the superior, as a common father, must assist the needy out of the surplus of the more opulent settlements, putting all both in Pennsylvania and Maryland in the *vita communis*, or the ordinary way of living, and succor them in their incidental losses and burdens, with the bowels of true Christian and religious charity."

The spirit of disinterested zeal for religion which pervades the regulations and instructions addressed to the missionaries in this country, by the superiors in England, is truly edifying. One of these was:

"All must leave to the superior of the mission the free disposition of themselves, and be ready to change their habitation and mission when it shall seem to him requisite or convenient, or to God's greater honor and glory; and this, though the change should prove hard and less agreeable to nature, justly fearing their labors would not be attended with a blessing from heaven, in a place of their own choosing, and without the sanction of obedience." It was urged upon the missionaries to support their establishments out of the product of their lands: in the purchase and improvement of which considerable sums of money furnished by their English brethren

* Sometimes written Cowrisseoppen, and at others Cushenhoppen.

had been expended. One of the regulations, after stating that "all independence upon seculars, so desirable in itself, so much recommended by our holy rules and constitutions, must by all possible means be maintained," further prescribes that "Maryland must necessarily order things so as to support itself, as the general's orders require, and all our colleges and districts do; lest otherwise that flourishing mission (which God forbid) run to decay for want of fresh supplies, or it be found necessary to levy charitable contributions upon those for whose help and assistance they are procured." By the term "supplies," were meant additional missionaries, which the want of theological seminaries in this country made it necessary to procure from Europe, to supply the vacancies occasioned by death or disqualification. It had been resolved, in 1751, that the sum of two hundred pounds should be contributed annually by the several missions, or settlements in Maryland and Pennsylvania, "for the public good, and for procuring fresh supplies, and sending home those who are less fit for service." The provincial directed in 1759; "but then care must be had that this burden be equalled, as much as may be, to the circumstances of each settlement, and when one is found to be overrated, the superior must see the party grieved be eased, and portion out the grievance upon others better able to bear it. And the superior was required to ascertain "if any of ours run into any unnecessary expenses in house-keeping, either not contenting themselves with more or less college fare, or affecting to keep open table, and inviting seculars, to the prejudice of holy poverty and regularity," and "if any thing be done against poverty in general."

At an early period the Pennsylvania missioners were indebted to the pious munificence of an English gentleman for a good portion of their means of support. The writer has in vain searched for the date of the origin of what was long known as the Pennsylvania or German fund: but the earliest information he has been able to obtain is, that it was recorded by Bishop Challoner in a register in his handwriting, Sept. 29th, 1748.

Sir John James, its founder, gave four thousand pounds as a principal, out of the product of which he ordered forty pounds per annum to be employed for the support of two priests to assist the poor in London; and the remainder to be applied to the support of missioners in Pennsylvania.

The amount of the Pennsylvania fund was originally as much as one hundred pounds sterling per annum; it was reduced to eighty pounds in 1791, and in 1797 it fell to fifty-nine pounds ten shillings and eight pence, and subsequently declined to about fifty-five pounds sterling—which it never afterwards exceeded.*

The following state of the Pennsylvania missions in the year 1765, prepared by Rev. George Hunter, at that time superior of the Jesuits in this country, was forwarded to England, to the Rev. James Dennett, then provincial of the English Jesuits.

First. Mission of St. Mary, Philadelphia.
Missionaries—two.

Annual income—by house rents,	- - -	£45
by salary from London,†		20
by regular gratuities,	-	25
		£90

Second. Mission of St. Paul—Cushenhoppen.
One missionary plantation, five hundred acres.

Annual income—by plantation,	- - -	£45
by salary (from London),		20
		£65

Third. Mission of St. John, Nepomucen, Lancaster-town.
One missionary—three lots in town, *chiefly settled.*

*One-third of the capital had been invested in a security, which in 1784 was stated to be "very precarious, the interest being ill paid, and large defalcations made from it when paid, and many people apprehend that the capital will be lost by a complete bankruptcy of the parties who hold the money." The other two-thirds were invested in the French funds, and in the years 1785 and 6, produced an annual interest of seventy pounds sterling. On the breaking out of the French revolution it was judged expedient by the trustee, who was Bishop Douglas the V. A. of London, to sell out the investment in French funds, and invest the proceeds in the English securities. Accordingly the sale was made in 1790, when the French stock was much depressed, and British four per cents purchased with the proceeds (one thousand two hundred and forty pounds, fourteen shillings and five pence); the British stock being then at one hundred two and a quarter, or a premium of two and a quarter per cent., and the fund sustaining a loss also by the difference of exchange between France and England, the result was that at least one-third of the whole fund left by Sir John James was sunk; and as the appropriation of forty pounds per annum for the poor of London was specific, the whole of the loss fell upon the Pennsylvania fund.

†Sir John James' foundation.

Annual income—by ground rent, - £4 5
by salary (from London), - - - - - - 20 0

£24 5

Fourth. Mission of St. Francis Regis, Conewago, one missionary Plantation, one hundred and twenty acres.

Annual income—by plantation, - £20 0
by salary (from London), - - - - 20 0

£40 0

Father Hunter states that the number of communicants in Pennsylvania, is about three thousand, and that the number of non-communicants, including children, is nearly the same; so that the number of Catholics in Pennsylvania, in the year 1765, was about six thousand.*

Every residence kept at its own expense a public meeting place for divine worship. The extent of country served by the missionaries is stated to be about one hundred and thirty miles long by thirty-five broad. Out of the above incomes every thing towards housekeeping was to be provided—clothing, taxes, quit rents, medical attendance, building and repairs; and where there was no land attached to the residence—as in Philadelphia and Lancaster—bread, meat, and fuel were also to be purchased. Mr. Hunter remarks that, in Pennsylvania, the missionaries were exempt from that hospitality which, in Maryland, was a heavy burthen. By which he probably refers to the custom in Maryland, of inviting those communicants who resided at a distance from the place where divine service was performed, to partake of breakfast or dinner at the residence of the clergy, after mass, on the days when they approached the holy communion,—being fasting, of course, according to the ancient precept of the church.

The above details, are condensed from the original paper, in the hand-writing of F. Hunter. The writer regrets that he is unable to furnish a more complete history of the early days of the Catholic church, and its first missionaries in Pennsylvania. But, although, those whom he knew to be possessed of any information on the subject have responded to his inquiries with the greatest courtesy and frankness, which he acknowledges with gratitude, much remains to be supplied.*

When Rev. Mr. Carroll paid his first visit to Philadelphia, in his character of superior of the mission, St. Joseph's church was in charge of two most interesting clergymen, who were worthy members of the Society of Jesus at the time of its suppression. These were Rev. Ferdinand Farmer, and Rev. Robert Molyneux.

The former, whose real name was *Steenmeyer*, had adopted the English signification of it after he came to this country, and was known universally by the name of *Father Farmer*. Born in the circle of Suabia, in Germany, 13th October, 1720, he was early initiated in the duties of piety and the elements of liberal learning: after completing the course of philosophy, he entered on the study of physic, to which he applied with success for three years. Called by Almighty God to a religious state, he entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus, at Landesperge on 26th September, 1743, and was admitted to the profession of the four vows on the 2d of February, 1761, while in America. Stimulated by an ardent zeal for the salvation of souls, he offered himself for foreign missions, and was appointed for China. By the decree of Providence an unexpected disappointment changed his destination. Having been united to the English province, he was sent to the Maryland mission, in the words of his intimate friend and associate in the sacred ministry,† "to bless this western hemisphere with the bright examples of his virtues, and raise him an ornament to the little society he served, by a faithful and able discharge of the duties of his ministry."

He arrived in this country on the 20th June,

* Watson, in the second edition of his Annals, states that "in 1757, Mr. Harding reported the number of Catholics in Pennsylvania, at the request of the Governor. In Philadelphia 139—Chester county 4, the whole number in the state, including Germans, &c. men, women, and children, about two thousand souls." There must be some error in Mr. Watson's statement: either in the date or in the number of Catholics in Philadelphia.

* He would feel obliged for any communications *by mail*, that would enable him to supply the deficiencies of these memoirs—which may, by himself, or some one better qualified, be made to assume a less imperfect form at a future day, should they be found sufficiently interesting.

† F. Molyneux, in his funeral sermon, Philadelphia, 1786.

1752, and began his mission at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, where he resided six years in all the poverty and humility of an apostle. Called to Philadelphia in the year 1758, he was stationed at St. Joseph's, but made frequent missionary excursions not only in the state of Pennsylvania, but to the state of New Jersey, and subsequently to New York. He visited Concord in May and November, 1759, and the same year officiated at a station known as Geiger's in New Jersey, and he extended his visits in the latter state in subsequent years to Huntingdon, Mount Hope, Ringwood, Longpond, Charlotteburg, and various other places, celebrating the divine mysteries, baptizing, marrying, and, in short, supplying the scattered people of these various places with all the aids of his holy ministry.

The increase of his labors is shown by the records which he kept with the greatest exactitude. Thus, in 1759, the number of baptisms was seventy-eight; in 1778 they amounted to one hundred and forty-five, and, in 1783, to one hundred and fifty-nine. In one of his letters to Rev. Mr. Carroll, 6th of March, 1780, he says: "As for the members of our small congregations abroad, they are used to be served gratis." Throughout the whole of the revolutionary war, he was engaged in active missionary duties, and, amid the busy scenes which then and afterwards made Philadelphia the most interesting city in America, he discharged with great success the duties of senior clergyman or vicar at home, and was the founder of distant missions, which he visited with regularity even to the last year of his life. He was the founder of the Catholic congregation in the city of New York, and, even after other priests officiated there, the trouble and responsibility of organization, and of reconciling the discordant elements of that congregation, devolved on him, and multiplied his labors and increased his anxiety. The character of this excellent pastor may be best understood from the funeral discourse pronounced by his associate in the ministry for fifteen years, when his remains were surrounded by those who had been the objects of his pastoral solicitude and the witnesses of his virtues, during his long residence amongst them.

"His learning, and other commendable qualifications, soon drew the public notice. Hence, without seeking for honor, he was admitted, by the suffrages of learned acquaintance, a member of the Philosophical Society. To his correspondence with Father Myers, late astronomer to the elector palatine, now duke of Bavaria, that society is indebted for some curious pieces of that celebrated mathematician on the transit of Venus, dedicated to the empress of Russia. He had since been appointed to the board of trustees of the university of this city; but his multiplied immediate functions of another nature prevented him often from giving that punctual attendance to the duties of these appointments, and from being of that general utility, for which inclination, as well as abilities, would have otherwise rendered him well qualified. . . . . .

"While the poor shall bless his memory for his liberal charities and generous benefactions; while all tongues shall speak in praise of the many great endowments of his enlightened mind and upright heart; some admiring his penetrating judgment, his lively genius, his extensive memory, particularly in the sacred branches, and general knowledge in the sciences; others extolling his courteous affability and uniform deportment through the full career of life; you, who are the parents of children regenerated by his ministering hands at the font of baptism, will recollect the salutary lessons he delivered, and the charge he gave you to educate those pledges of your mutual affection, in the fear and love of Almighty God, the common Father of us all; warning them to hold fast to the vows of their baptism, that, living on earth as dutiful children of the heavenly Father, they might one day become heirs of his kingdom.

"Many will long remember with what unwearied solicitude he acted the part of a tender and vigilant shepherd, sparing no pains or labor to seek out and reclaim any of the flock under his charge, that had unhappily strayed out of the sweet pastures of virtue and righteousness, in which he strove to feed and preserve them from every infection of vice, and danger of perversion. His fatiguing and extensive excursions through a neighboring state, and various parts of this, in search of little flocks scattered in the wilderness, will be long retained in their minds, and preserved in their breasts, as grateful monuments of his unwearied zeal, and unbounded charity; and as perennial proofs of the faithful performance of the duties of his ministry.

"There is yet a hidden treasure, laid up in heaven, unseen and unknown to the world, but highly precious before God, who knows the inward man, and searches our reins and hearts. Those scenes of silent contemplation on heavenly truths, and secret conversation with God himself, to whom he daily poured forth his pious soul in ecstacies of love, and raptures of admiration of the divine perfections. Could the humble cell of his late earthly habitation but relate what hath passed in these moments, it would go beyond what you have yet heard or seen. These are those inward beauties of the righteous soul, those springs which impart life and action to all that outwardly appears for zealous and virtuous, and imprint the stamp of solid worth and merit. These will be found to shine no inferior ornaments in the celestial crown. View him, in fine, through private or public life, you will not find him intentionally swerving from that golden device of the institute of his order, *the greater glory of God.* This appears to have been the origin, the aim and end to which, through every step of life, his mind and heart have uniformly been directed."*

The discourse from which the above extracts are taken was published at length in the newspapers of Pennsylvania, and translated into German.

Rev. Robert Molyneux was a native of England, born in Lancashire on the 24th of June, 1738, and admitted a novice in the Society of Jesus in 1757, and, soon after his promotion to the priesthood, was sent to Maryland. He arrived in March, 1771, and was stationed at St. Joseph's church, Philadelphia, where he continued to exercise his ministry fifteen or sixteen years. He was a man of extensive learning, solid piety, of the most amiable temper, and irreproachable purity of life. His acquaintance with polite literature, and intercourse with polished society, added to lively wit, and agreeable conversation, made him a favorite with the most intelligent, and enabled him to impart the lessons of morality and religion in circles which could not have been reached by the more austere moralist. On the arrival of the Marquis de la Luzerne as minister plenipotentiary from France, F. Molyneux was a welcome visiter at his mansion in Philadelphia, and became instructor in the English language to that nobleman. Eminently disinterested, his sole aim was the good of religion, and during his arduous ministry he labored assiduously among the poorer classes, and in teaching and catechising children, with the true spirit of a minister of God. He was one of the first priests in this country, if not the first, who by means of the press endeavored to disabuse the public mind of their erroneous conceptions of Catholic doctrines, and to disseminate correct expositions of the true faith. By distributing Catholic books imported from England, and by reprinting in this country such works as Challoner's Catholic Christian Instructed, the History of the Bible, and catechisms and other elementary books, he contributed much to the diffusion of correct information, and to the instruction of Catholics, not only in Philadelphia but throughout the country.

The union of Fathers Farmer and Molyneux was most happily adapted to the situation in which they were placed, and delightful to themselves. Both eminently learned, and both devoted, with their whole hearts, to every duty of their sacred calling, they were at once companions, examples, and counsellors for each other. Father Farmer was equally polished in his manners with his colleague, and both were esteemed and welcomed in the most enlightened society in Philadelphia, whenever their laborious duties permitted them the interchange or enjoyment of social courtesy. At the period of the suppression of the Society of Jesus, Father Farmer had been thirty years a member of that body, and Father Molyneux for sixteen years. Thus a long experience in the same discipline, and the practice of the same exercises had formed in them similar habits of life, and imbued them with the principles of self-denial, and zeal for the glory of God and the good of their neighbor, which were the characteristics of their society throughout its illustrious career. Though eighteen years older than Mr. M., Father Farmer's light and active person qualified him better than his colleague—who was corpulent, and less capable of physical exertion—for the labors of attending the distant missions, many of which he had founded; and, many of these missions being among German settlers, his knowledge of their language was of the utmost advantage; while his adaptation to sedentary

* Funeral Sermon on the death of the Rev. Ferdinand Farmer. Philadelphia, 1786.

pursuits made Father Molyneux invaluable in a city congregation. Hence Father Farmer generally visited the most distant missions, at which times Father Molyneux was always to be found at St. Joseph's. The labors of these two clergymen had become very oppressive previous to the visit of Rev. Mr. Carroll, although there were other priests then laboring in Philadelphia.

Though far advanced in years, and much broken in health, Father Farmer felt so much interest in the congregations in New Jersey and New York, that he determined on paying them his usual visit, and left Philadelphia for this purpose about the 10th of April, 1785.

In a letter to Rev. Mr. Carroll, dated 23d April, Rev. Mr. Molyneux thus refers to the condition of his colleague. "Mr. Farmer is now absent two weeks, on his tour to the Iron works and New York; it will be two more before he returns. 'He was very weak when he left here; if he lives to return, I wish some means could be devised to prevent him from going any more." And again: "He is no more fit to take that journey than I am to fast forty days and nights, like St. Stylites, without eating or drinking." Referring to the labors of his own station in the same letter, he solicits assistance, and desires to be relieved of a burden he has borne for thirteen years. He says, adverting to the failure of some to comply with the jubilee, "I am sorry for it, but can not help it. I exhort, I entreat, but the world runs away with the seed we endeavor to sow. To preserve a flock so exposed requires a multiplied care, and a zealous care—a care above our leisure and strength."

Rev. Mr. Farmer returned from his last visit to New York, 7th May; of the difficulties he had encountered there, more will be said in treating of the history of the Catholic church in that state, in a future number.

A letter to Rev. Mr. Carroll, written by Rev. Mr. Molyneux, December 7th, 1784, furnishes the following statement of the number of Catholics in Pennsylvania.

"The number of our communicants at Easter generally amount to - - - - - 1,000
In the country congregations near to 200
But in Philadelphia, of non-communicants, I think I may venture to set down 1,000 more, children under twelve years excepted.
Mr. Ritter, at Goshenhoppen, two years ago, numbered communicants at - 500
Mr. Geisler (at Lancaster), I suppose, may number about - - - - - - 700
Mr. Pellentz (at Conewago), above - 1,000

3,400."

If the supposed number of adult non-communicants be estimated at 3,400, and the number of Catholic children under twelve years of age at about 1,500, the number of Catholics in Pennsylvania in 1784 was probably between 7,000 and 8,000.

When Rev. Mr. Carroll arrived in Philadelphia he found two congregations, too numerous for the scanty accommodations afforded by St. Joseph's and St. Mary's, then the only Catholic churches in that city. The priests were too few to attend well to the many calls upon them, with any regard to their own comfort. But he was edified by the piety and regularity of the Catholics of Philadelphia. They were well instructed in their religion, and generally exemplary in their conduct. The prejudice, too, that had existed against Catholics, had been dispelled to a great extent, not only by their unexceptionable deportment as citizens, but by the more enlightened views of civil and religious liberty, produced by the discussion of the principles of government among the statesmen whom the meetings of congress had assembled in Philadelphia. In addition to the representatives of France and Spain, the large number of French military and naval officers who frequented Philadelphia and attended the Catholic worship, and whose chaplains celebrated mass in the Catholic churches, impressed the candid though uninformed Protestant more favorably in his estimate of a religion which is never depressed but by means of misrepresentation and slander.

At the close of the revolutionary war a *Te Deum* was sung in St. Joseph's church by the request of the French minister, at which Gen. Washington, La Fayette, and the military staff attended. Mr. Fitzsimmons, one of the most respectable Catholics of Philadelphia, was a member of congress, and, as the debates exhibit, one of the most practical and useful business men in that body. General Stephen Moylan, the first quartermaster general of the revolutionary army, and who, as colonel, commanded the fourth regiment of cavalry, which

served during the greater part of the war, and the gallant Commodore Barry, were Catholics. The latter was a constant attendant at a Catholic church when in the city, and by his will left legacies for a Catholic school; and the bright examples afforded by a Father Farmer for nearly thirty years, and of Rev. Mr. Molyneux and the many other faithful clergymen who had exemplified in their lives, the poverty, labor, self-denial, and charity of the priest of God, who seeks not himself, but the will of him that sent him — all had contributed to produce feelings of perfect harmony and good will between Catholics and Protestants, that made Philadelphia truly a city of brotherly love.

TO BE CONTINUED.

CATHOLIC CHARITY.

We sing of that charity sent us from heaven,
Sweetest offspring of love, by the Saviour first given,
Through this world, like a river, to roll;
Oh! see on its margin, how verdant the fields,
How beauteous the blossoms each fair meadow yields;
Their fragrance, how sweet to the soul!

From the fountain of mercy that gushed from the side
Of the crucified Saviour, this pure, sparkling tide
Of Catholic charity flowed;
It has watered all nations, and now, through the earth,
To the germs of affection it gives a new birth,
And refreshes our dreary abode.

Behold yon proud mansion, exalted on high,
Extending its columns as if to the sky,
With its lofty and beautiful dome;
It is no feudal castle, no ivy wreathed tower,
No heirloom of wealth, nor a fortress of power;
But it is, for the houseless, a *home*.

Unnumbered, such "roof-trees" arise from the soil
Which this broad river laves,—where, from anguish and toil,
The suff'rer a refuge may find;
For the waters of charity e er bounteously flow
O'er the land, and fair flowers spontaneously grow
In a climate so genial and kind.

The friendless, forsaken, and destitute child,
On whom the glad sunlight of joy never smiled,
Is, for charity's sake, hither led;
While the fruits of benevolence, clust'ring around,
Are, with lavish profusion, strewed over the ground,
And the poor little orphan is fed.

Sweet sisters of mercy, who lowlily bend
By the side of the wretch in the dungeon, and tend
So kindly to lighten his wo;
Methinks ye are ministering angels from heaven,
Sent to earth; for, oh! how is such charity given
To frail, erring creatures below!

Ne'ertheless, it is so,—for in cottage or tower,
In palace or prison, 'mid sorrow's dark hour,
Are these Sisters of Charity found,
To calm the wild ravings of anguish, and lull
The worn spirit, sweet blossoms to cull,
And scatter their perfume around!

For the soul that has bathed in that pure crystal stream
Becomes a rich garden, and heaven's bright beam
Gilds each flow'ret with love's deepest hue;
And this (with the chain of communion that binds
In mutual kindness e'en dissonant minds)
Seems an Eden on earth to renew.

In pestilence, famine,—in peace, or in war,—
By sea, or by land,—at home, or afar,—
Dear charity's power is felt;
The savage, the warrior, the king on his throne,
The hero, the captive its magic will own,
And like snow in its warm current melt.

Hail, beautiful river, majestic and grand!
That kindly refreshes each Catholic land,
And swells, as it onward is driven;
Surmounting all hind'rance, o'ercoming all foes,
Submerging the powers of hell, as it flows
To eternity's ocean in heaven! S. R. T.

Louisville, Ky., March 4, 1845.

NOTICE OF CARDINAL CHEVERUS,

FIRST BISHOP OF BOSTON.

HIS eminent individual was born in France, in the town of Mayenne, on the 28th of January, 1768. His family was most respectable, and enjoyed universal esteem. His father held a high station in the judicature, and his mother was a lady of remarkable character, who understood perfectly the education of children. Wishing to keep her son under her own eyes during his first studies, he remained under the paternal roof, and went every day to the college of Mayenne, for instruction in the elements of knowledge. Brilliant success attended his application and efforts, whilst modesty prevented him from being vain of his superiority. He united with great talents a rare piety, which procured him admission to his first communion, at the age of eleven years. Soon after, he felt a desire to enter the ecclesiastical state, and was tonsured the year following by the bishop of Dol. He honored the habit which he wore by the exemplary piety which he exhibited in discharging the offices intrusted to him in the temple of God. The bishop of Mans, being on a visit at Mayenne, became acquainted with him, and was so much pleased with his pious dispositions and his talents, that he offered his father a place for him at the college of Louis le Grand in Paris. Another favor which the youthful ecclesiastic owed to his precocious merit, was his being nominated to a benefice of eight hundred livres of income, by the count of Provence, afterwards King Louis XVIII, and his being appointed almoner extraordinary of the same prince.

The college of Louis le Grand, into which the young Cheverus was received, offered at that time many dangers to unexperienced students: some of its directors and pupils were then engaged in making preparations for the bloody tragedy of the French revolution. Aware of the peril of his critical situation, our pious youth adopted measures calculated to avert the dangers which threatened him. He made choice of a wise director, in the person of the Rev. Mr. Augé—a talented and exemplary priest, known since as the director of Stanislaus college, and the author of the "Miroir du clergé." Encouraged and aided by this faithful guide and monitor, the religious scholar improved in virtue and science, and caused his bishop to say: "My little abbé de Cheverus will be one day the first ecclesiastic of my diocess.

After a few years' stay at college, the young Cheverus, desirous of having better opportunities to fit himself for the sacred ministry, entered the theological seminary of St. Magloire, in which he had secured a place for himself by the display of his talents and knowledge. This institution was governed by the Oratorians—a body of learned clergy, who gave to the church many of its brightest ornaments. At St. Magloire were then studying the celebrated abbé M'Carthy, and Mr. Dubois, the late venerable bishop of New York; both of whom, like Mr. Cheverus, proved to be men of exalted sentiments, of deep piety, breathing naught but the glory of God, and the salvation of souls.

In October, 1790, Mr. Cheverus received the order of deacon, and was raised to the sacerdotal dignity on the 18th of the following December. Invested with the sacred character, he set out for Mayenne, where he celebrated his first mass on Christmas night. At the request of his uncle, who was parish priest of Mayenne, he aided him in the functions of the holy ministry in the capacity of his vicar; but the bishop, to show that he appreciated the high qualifications of the new priest, appointed him canon of his cathedral.

But the time of trial was now approaching for the French clergy. Mr. Cheverus imitated the noble firmness of the great majority of the ecclesiastics, in refusing to take the constitutional oath tendered them.

On the demise of his uncle in January, 1792, Mr. Cheverus succeeded him in the pastorship of the church of Mayenne, and was besides raised to the office of vicar-general of the diocess of Mans. These new dignities, which increased his popularity with the well-intentioned, imbittered against him the hatred of the partisans of the revolution, and he was compelled to flee, to guard his family from serious injury.

He repaired to Loval, where he remained some time, strictly watched by the authorities; but, availing himself of a slight indisposition, he asked leave to spend a few days with his family, with the intent to proceed to England. Accordingly, he bade farwell to his friends and relatives, many of whom he was destined never more to see, and set out for Paris in disguise. He reached this capital on the 25th of June. During the massacre of the 2d and 3d of September, he hid himself in the room of his brother, then a collegian at Louis le Grand. When he afterwards spoke of this memorable circumstance, he used to say: "How I could have wished that a bullet had placed me by the side of so many martyrs." Shortly after he made his way to Calais, where he arrived on the 11th of September, 1792.

The situation of Mr. Cheverus on landing in England was any thing but pleasant. He knew not the language, and had for all pecuniary resource the moderate sum of sixty dollars. However, full of energy, and of confidence in divine Providence, he declined to receive any share of the provision made by the generosity of the English government for the French exiles. He forthwith applied himself to acquire a knowledge of the language, and after three months was capable of giving lessons in French and mathematics. At the end of a year, his zeal suggested to him the thought of rendering his knowledge of English beneficial to the salvation of his neighbor, and for this purpose he asked and obtained permission from the vicar apostolic of the London district, to act as pastor of the few Catholics residing in the vicinity. The result of his first address to his little flock gave him great consolation. On inquiring of an humble individual what he thought of his first sermon, he was answered with great simplicity: "Your sermon, sir, was not like other sermons; there was not a single dictionary

word in it, every word could be understood." After a few years spent in the labors of the ministry, Mr. Cheverus was reflecting on the propriety of leaving England, where priests were so numerous, and going where his services might be more needed, when he received a letter from Dr. Matignon, the pastor of the Catholics of Boston, inviting him to come and cultivate a portion of the vineyard placed under his care. Mr. Cheverus, after mature deliberation, concluded to accept the offer of his venerable friend, and, embarking for America, arrived at Boston on the 3d of October, 1796. The close intimacy, the virtues and learning of these two eminent clergymen soon attracted the attention of the Protestants of Boston, who publicly and frequently expressed their admiration at the spectacle presented by these two French priests. "Are these," they said, "the Catholics of whom we have heard so much ill; the papists who have been painted to us in colors so dark?" "These men," said a Protestant clergyman who had visited them to convince them of the error of their faith, "these men are so learned that there is no arguing with them; their lives are so pure and evangelical as to leave no room for reproach; and I am much afraid that the influence of so much virtue, joined to so much knowledge, will give us a great deal of trouble." Mr. Cheverus especially became exceedingly popular in Boston, owing to his superior attainments and the cordiality which he exhibited in his intercourse with all classes of people, but more especially on account of his devotedness to the duties of his ministry and the wants of the poor Catholics who formed this congregation. Protestants delighted to listen to his discourses, and he was often asked by ministers of various denominations to preach in their churches. "His eloquence," said one of their journals, "is persuasive in the extreme: one feels that all he says emanates from the purest and noblest sentiments; his sermons, which are always too short, overflow with the tenderest piety; it would seem as if a seraph had touched his lips with a burning coal from the altar of the Most High."

Bishop Carroll, desirous to show his appreciation of the distinguished merit of Mr. Cheverus, offered him the pastorship of the church of St. Mary in Philadelphia, which the latter begged permission to decline, being unwilling to forsake his excellent friend, Mr. Matignon.

Not long afterwards, he visited for the first time the Indians of the state of Maine, and remained three months with them, performing with great hardship the various functions of his ministry, among these poor people who had adhered to the faith taught them by their fathers, although they had not seen a priest for fifty years. This excursion among the savage children of the forest, Mr. Cheverus continued to make every year for the same length of time, even after he had been raised to the dignity of bishop. A new occasion of displaying his apostolical charity awaited Mr. Cheverus when he returned for the first time from this visit to the Indians. The yellow fever was raging in Boston, and had already carried off many victims. He at once devoted himself to the care of all who were attacked with the malady, rendering every service that their situation required; acting at the same time in the capacity of a nurse or distributer of alms, and of a minister of God. It was at this period that the attachment and veneration of the people of Boston for Mr. Cheverus reached the highest point. Wherever he appeared, every one was anxious to do him honor; the first place was reserved for him; and at table he was invariably asked to bless the table even by Protestant clergymen. When John Adams, then President of the U. S., came to Boston, Mr. de Cheverus was invited to the banquet given to the chief magistrate, and sat next to his Excellency. A still greater mark of consideration was given him by the legislature of Massachusetts, who asked him to examine the formula of an oath to be taken by voters at elections, and to modify it so that it might not be opposed in the least to the principles of Catholics.

At this time the Catholics of Boston had no church, properly so called, but attended divine service in private houses that had been converted into chapels. Mr. Cheverus, seeing his flock increase, and witnessing the desire of Protestants to see the ceremonies of the church, opened a subsciption for the erection of a church in Boston. The first to put his name on the list was the President of the U. S., whose example was followed by the most distinguished members of the Protestant community. Several years elapsed before its completion, as the

prudent pastor would not continue the work unless the funds to cover the expenses were at hand. At length, in 1803, by a new effort on the part of the people who wished to give that satisfaction to their pastor as a mark of their gratitude for the assurance he gave them, that he was determined to remain with them, although strongly urged to go back to his native country, the edifice was finished in four months, and the holy cross to which it was dedicated was mounted upon its roof. On the 29th of September of that year Bishop Carroll consecrated the new church. The fame of Mr. Cheverus for piety and learning, was so widely spread, that Mrs. Seton, who was then deliberating on embracing the Catholic faith, had recourse to him in an epistolary correspondence, for the explanation of her doubts and difficulties. Not satisfied with answering her objections, with the talent he possessed, he prayed and offered mass in her behalf, and thus became entitled to a share in the abundant fruits of holiness and charity that had flowed, and still continue to flow from the memorable conversion of Mother Seton. Mr. Matignon, having declined the honors of the episcopate, proposed Mr. Cheverus to fill that important station, and he was accordingly appointed first bishop of Boston, by Pius VII, on the 8th of April, 1808. Though it was repugnant to his feelings, to be elevated above his aged and venerable friend Mr. Matignon, he was obliged to acquiesce. He repaired to Baltimore for his consecration; made the customary retreat at the seminary under the direction of its superior, Rev. Mr. Nagot, and was consecrated in the old cathedral by Archbishop Carroll, who was assisted by his coadjutor, the Right Rev. Dr. Neale, and the right Rev. Dr. Egan, bishop of Philadelphia. Three days later, on the 4th, he preached in the same church at the consecration of Bishop Flaget. He paid a well merited compliment to the Society of St. Sulpice, to which Mr. Flaget belonged, and quoted the words of Fenelon on his death-bed. "I know nothing more venerable and more apostolical than the Society of St. Sulpice."

Invested with so high an office, Bishop Cheverus changed nothing in his manner of life: it was the same simplicity, the same cordiality, the same spirit of poverty. To mention but one or two facts which speak volumes, we are told by his biographer that he cut his own firewood, and was seen to carry it in his arms to the sick and destitute.

So many virtues joined to so much talent were not without producing effects on the minds of Protestants, and causing many to acknowledge the truth and embrace it. Among the conversions wrought by Mr. Cheverus, four are mentioned as deserving particular notice. They were those of Mr. Thomas Walley, a citizen of Boston, Mr. Samuel Bishop, a lawyer of Newcastle in Maine, and, above all, those of two Protestant clergymen, father and son. The zeal of Bishop Cheverus was not confined to his own diocess; he frequently visited New York at the request of the Jesuits who directed that church, and he consecrated the cathedral of St. Patrick's, and preached on the occasion.

On the death of the Most Rev. Dr. Carroll, his successor, Archbishop Neale, pressed Bishop Cheverus to accept the coadjutorship of Baltimore, deeming him most capable of aiding him during his life and filling his place after his demise. The humble prelate remonstrated, and caused the archbishop to give up his intention, Mr. Cheverus agreeing to visit Baltimore from time to time to aid the archbishop with his advice, and to take his place immediately after his death. But Mr. Cheverus prevailed on Dr. Neale to have a coadjutor appointed.

Being now sure to remain with his flock, Bishop Cheverus, to accelerate the advancement of religion, invited the Ursulines to open an academy in Boston, and by his influence silenced the clamors of prejudice that were rising against them. He lived to see the establishment of these accomplished ladies destroyed by an infuriated mob, and the refusal of the Massachusetts legislature to do aught in compensation of their losses. The monks of La Trappe found also in him a protector when they came to this country to found an establishment of their order.

In the month of September, 1818, the death of Dr. Matignon caused the tears of his affectionate friend to flow in abundance. The loss of this venerable associate, together with a serious complaint in the form of an asthma, made Bishop Cheverus think of retiring from his diocess to end his days, which he thought near their close, in the midst of his family.

Several years, however, passed without his coming to a decision, when, in the beginning of 1823, he received a letter from the grand almoner of France, announcing his nomination to the bishopric of Montauban. Agitated by contending feelings on the reception of this unexpected letter, he consulted several persons of confidence on the course he should follow, and finally wrote back his reasons for declining the appointment. But, on being further pressed, he deemed it proper to acquiesce in the views of others, and made arrangements for an early departure. He left to the diocess, to his friends and the poor, every thing he had, determined to leave the United States with no other property than the trunk which he had brought with him twenty-seven years before.

He embarked at New York, on the 1st of October, in company with the Rev. Mr. Moranvillé of Baltimore, and reached the coast of Normandy, after being shipwrecked, on the last of the same month.

"It was not without feelings of the liveliest joy that Bishop Cheverus, after an absence of more than thirty years, found himself again in his native land, and surrounded by clergymen some of whom had been his companions in exile. From Auderville he went to Cherbourg, and thence to Paris, where he had the pleasure of meeting many of his ancient acquaintances. At length, having proceeded to Mayenne, where his family had long and anxiously looked for him, he visited all his relatives in the city and surrounding country, preached at Mayenne, Laval, Ernée, and other places, and delighted every one by his amiable and engaging manners.

"His arrival at Montauban, the 28th of July, 1824, was accompanied with every demonstration of joy and respect on the part of the inhabitants. Protestants as well as Catholics, in conjunction with the public authorities, went forth to meet him, evincing with rival efforts the high regard they entertained for their prelate. Here, as at Boston, he gained the affections of every heart. Every one was struck with the simplicity of his manner and the charms of his disposition. Many incidents are related of him which show the admirable facility he had of meriting the love of his people, and the devotedness with which he studied their welfare. Having understood that one of the parish priests of his diocess was not on good terms with the mayor of the city in which he lived, the bishop called on this officer who was then at Montauban, and, without reprimanding him or entering upon any explanation of the matter, he told him simply, in a most affectionate manner, he had a favor to ask of him. The mayor immediately expressed his extreme willingness to render him every service in his power; upon which the bishop embraced him on the cheek, and said, *Carry that to your parish priest.* Overcome by this amiable expedient, the mayor could not but promise that all causes of complaint would in future be forgotten, and that a reconciliation between him and his curate was already effected.

"In the month of July, 1826, the see of Bordeaux became vacant by the death of Archbishop d'Aviau, whose piety, prudence, and amiable disposition had justly won for him the highest esteem and veneration. The distress of the inhabitants in being deprived of so valuable a man was extreme; and it was thought by the minister of France that the best compensation for so great a loss would be the appointment of Bishop Cheverus to that important station. He was accordingly nominated to the see of Bordeaux before the end of July, and shortly after he was promoted to the peerdom; a favor the more distinguished, as no one shared with him the honor of his elevation. Archbishop Cheverus arrived at Bordeaux on the 14th of December; but his reputation had long preceded him. The affliction of all who belonged to his former diocess, the glowing colors in which they represented his virtues, his charity, his amiability, his simplicity of manner, had prepossessed every mind in his favor. But the kind disposition of the prelate, the great tact and wisdom he exhibited in the first acts of his administration, far surpassed the expectation of the public, who seemed to have found in their good archbishop another Aviau, so affable was he at all times, and so zealously devoted to their welfare.

"Archbishop Cheverus was the father of his clergy. He not only received with kindness the priests of his diocess, when they visited Bordeaux, but expressly declared his desire that they should have no other table than his, unless their friends or relatives in the city invited them elsewhere. He was equally pleased in entertaining his friends in Bordeaux,

and strangers who called to see him; deeming it a great point to keep up a friendly intercourse with his diocesans, and particularly with his clergy, who were all perfectly well known to him. Politics were discarded from his parlor; even before the revolution of July he had enjoined a strict silence in relation to those subjects. Such was his prudence that, notwithstanding the diversity of opinion and the warmth of party spirit, the most inflammatory papers of the times did not dare to animadvert upon his sentiments or conduct. Only once was he represented to have spoken too strongly in the pulpit; but the charge soon fell to the ground, and was well known to be incompatible with his habits of wisdom and reserve.

"On the subject of the ordinances of the 16th of June, 1828, when the bishops of France were assembled in different places for their consideration, Archbishop Cheverus appeared to dissent from his colleagues. Undoubtedly he did not approve of the ordinances, nor did he consider it expedient to adopt the memorial presented to the king by Card. de Clermont Tonnerre, in the name of the French hierarchy. Certain passages of the memorial were too strongly expressed; but this difficulty was soon removed and the matter brought to a close.

"After the revolution in July, 1830, all those who had been raised to the peerage by Charles X were deprived of this distinction. On that occasion, the following article was inserted by Archbishop Cheverus in the papers of Bordeaux: 'Without approving the measure of exclusion affecting the peers created by Charles X, I am exceedingly happy to find myself out of the political world, and I am determined never to accept any office or function of that description. It is my desire to live in the midst of my flock, and to exercise among them a ministry of charity, union, and peace. In my instructions, I shall teach them to obey the existing government, and shall not fail to inculcate that duty by my own example. Both my clergy and myself, with those who have been committed to our charge, will pray incessantly for the prosperity of our beloved country. The inhabitants of Bordeaux have become still dearer to my heart, and I thank them cordially for the friendship they have thought proper to extend to me. My fondest wish is to live and die among them; but with no other title than that of an archbishop and a friend:'

"From this period to that of his death our worthy prelate left his diocess but once, and that was on the occasion of his nomination to the cardinalship. Occupied solely with the duties of his station, he visited his flock and saw every thing thrive under his wise and peaceful government.

"The high reputation he every where enjoyed was a shield that protected his clergy during the most disastrous times, and averted from his diocess the unfortunate troubles that were witnessed in so many other places. While several prelates, with their ecclesiastics, were obliged to leave their homes, Archbishop Cheverus remained at his post, and was always on terms of amity with those who were in power. Mr. de Preissac, a civil officer of distinction, though a Protestant, took great pleasure in affording him every facility for the execution of his plans, and the other Protestants of Bordeaux were not less favorably disposed. The good archbishop was at a loss to account for the attentions and civilities he received from all clases of society. 'I am completely spoiled,' he used to say, 'and I have always been spoiled, but I know not why.' The fact was, his modesty concealed from him what was obvious to every one else, and attracted universal esteem.

"The eminent and able qualities of Archbishop Cheverus had, ever since the year 1832, awakened a general desire of seeing him decorated with the purple; but the troubles in Italy were for a long time an obstacle to the presentation. Far from taking any active interest in his promotion, he was much surprised to find that he had been selected for the honors of the cardinalship, and told his friends plainly that the dignity belonged to another person. In his letter to the sovereign pontiff, on that occasion, he spoke of the red hat as an object of pure indifference to him, unless it came from the good will of his holiness, and he had no difficulty in saying that the honor should have been conferred on some other prelate.

"On the 1st of February, 1836, the pope declared him cardinal, and he repaired to Paris, where the red cap was presented to him by an officer of the apostolic chamber, and on the 9th of March he received the red hat with the ceremony usual on such occasions. Shortly

after, his eminence visited his family from whom he had been separated for many years, and then returned to his diocess, from which it was painful for him to be absent. Having been solicited to spend a few days in his former diocess of Montauban, he complied with the request of his friends, and excited by his presence a real enthusiasm among the people. But, alas! these emotions of joy were soon to be followed by the most poignant grief. The health of Cardinal Cheverus had for some time been visibly declining, and he seemed to anticipate some fearful occurrence. On the 13th of July, in the afternoon, he expressed a wish to make his confession, though it was not the day on which he generally approached the sacrament of penance. During the night he appeared to suffer much uneasiness, and in the morning he was found to be in a state of insensibility. The sacrament of extreme unction was immediately administered, and prayers were offered up in the different churches of the city. Notwithstanding every effort of medical skill to arrest the progress of the disease, it became gradually more violent, and on the 19th the cardinal breathed his soul into the hands of God. It would be difficult to describe the grief and consternation that pervaded the diocess upon the announcement of this melancholy news. On the evening of the 19th an immense concourse of persons, of every class, assembled at the archiepiscopal palace, to bid a last adieu to the worthy prelate whom they had looked upon as a father and a friend. Grief was depicted in every countenance. *Ah! what an excellent man we have lost!* exclaimed some, wiping the tears from their eyes, while others responded in mournful accents: *The poor will never forget him.* Could he have known that these eulogies would have been pronounced near his earthly remains, how much more glorious would they have appeared to him than the dignities that had been conferred on him, and to which he had never aspired! Cardinal Cheverus loved to mix with his flock, and exhibit a most sincere affection in return for the respect he universally received. Not long before his death he was heard to say, 'Pray to God that I may not be scorched by this red robe: I was much more happy without it, and I fear lest he should tell me one day, *You have received your reward in this life.*' Providence did not permit him to enjoy this honor for a long time, but the memory of his virtues will be ever graven upon the hearts of those who knew him. A fine mind, a most amiable disposition, extraordinary prudence, and eminent piety had won for him not only the respect and esteem of his clergy and the faithful under his charge, but even of those men who were strangers to religion. His funeral service was performed on the 26th of July, in the cathedral of Bordeaux, with great pomp and solemnity." P.

INVOCATION.

THE following words, adapted to the music of the prayer in "Otello," were sung at a sacred concert given for the benefit of a girls' free school in St. Louis.

O THOU bright spirit who, in heaven,
Regard'st our efforts here,
To whom Eternal Love hath given
The humble sufferer's care,
Bend low in kindness now thine ear,
As rise our voices high;
Receive each note of praise and prayer,
And gently bear it to the sky;
Oh, bear it to the sky!

'Tis mercy pleads in every strain
The cause of youthful wo;
Let not our voices swell in vain,
In vain our music flow;
But bend, bright spirit, from the skies,
Catch every note's low tone;
The heart's pure incense then shall rise,
Direct to its Creator's throne,
To its Creator's throne.

MOÏNA.

St. Louis, Mo.

INTELLIGENCE.

FOREIGN.

CATHOLICITY IN GERMANY.—The good old Catholic spirit is fast reviving in Germany. Torn and distracted by the reformation, *so called*, the Germans have, many of them, run through the whole cycle of error, and then either sunk wholely into the lethargy of indifference, or fallen into the abyss of infidelity. But the dark clouds which have settled over this unhappy country for nearly three centuries, are beginning to be dissipated. Germany is awakening to a sense of her happiness and glory when she was Catholic. A religious movement is in progress in Catholic Germany, which promises to restore many Protestants and infidels to the bosom of the Catholic church. Munich, in Bavaria, is the centre of this movement. Vast numbers have already been converted to Catholicity in this city, and also at Walzburg, Tubingen, Friburg, in Brisgau, and Bonn on the Rhine, other radiating points of Catholic light and intelligence. The Catholic universities established in all these places have already attained to great eminence; and Bavaria, which now confessedly leads all Germany in the fine arts and in polite literature, bids fair to lead also in other branches of learning. There is no doubt, at least, that Catholicity is rapidly progressing throughout Germany.

PROTESTANTISM IN GERMANY.—German Protestantism has truly reached a very low ebb. It has come down to the level of absolute and unconditional infidelity. Such was the obvious and natural tendency of the Protestant rule of private judgment, and we are not at all surprised at the collusion reached by the more intelligent among the German Protestants. All that surprises us is, that men of sense should still be found adhering to a principle thus fraught with mischief.—*Cath. Adv.*

We translate the following startling announcement from the French *Univers* of December 24, 1844.—*Ibid.*

"On the 29th of last May there was a meeting of the friends of Protestantism held at Coethen, Germany. It declared loudly against the doctrines of original sin, of the redemption, of the divinity of Jesus Christ, against his miraculous conception and nativity, and finally against the divinity and authenticity of the Scriptures. The entire abolition of the Apostles' Creed was also there proposed, with great consistency. The pastor of Halle, Mr. Wislizénus, declared with fierce energy against all the fundamental truths of the Christian faith. The day of the final shipwreck of Christian Protestantism in Germany, and of its final dissolution or absorption in absolute infidelity, seems to be already at hand."

DOMESTIC.

ARCHDIOCESS OF BALTIMORE.—*Dedication.*—On Friday, the 14th of March, the beautiful church of St. Alphonsus, in Baltimore, was dedicated to the worship of God. At nine o'clock a procession, consisting of several benevolent societies, and the pupils attached to the German Catholic schools, moved from St. James' church, with banners and music, to the place of dedication. The ceremony of the blessing was now performed by the Most Rev. Archbishop, according to the forms prescribed in the Roman Ritual, and the large number of clergymen and ecclesiastical students in attendance rendered it highly imposing, while the splendor and ornamental character of the building itself contributed in no small degree to enhance the joyful interest which such an occasion must naturally inspire. When the blessing of the church was completed, a pontifical high mass was celebrated by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Whelan, bishop of Richmond, at which the Most Rev. Archbishop assisted, in cope and mitre, attended by his vicar general, the Very Rev. Dr. Deluol, superior of St. Mary's Seminary. After the Gospel, the Rev. Charles I. White delivered a discourse from those words of Aggeus, ch. 2, "Great is the glory of this last house more than of the first." After briefly contrasting the magnificent style of the present building, and the humble simplicity of its predecessor which occupied a portion of the same site, he was naturally led to speak of the spirit of the Catholic church in the decoration of her religious temples and the pomp of her ceremonial, and to exhibit the grounds on which this point of her discipline is established. At the close of the high mass, a sermon in the German language was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Rumpler of New York, and the whole service was concluded by a solemn *Te Deum*, sung by the choir and the congregation present.

For a description of this elegant specimen of Gothic architecture, we must refer our readers to vol. ii, p. 297, of this Magazine.

Retreat.—A spiritual retreat for the laity was opened in the church of St. Vincent de Paul, on the 9th of March, and was closed on the 16th. The exercises were conducted by the Very Rev. Peter J. Verhægen, provincial of the Society of Jesus in the Maryland province, and Rev. John McElroy, S. J. Six gentlemen were in attendance at the confessionals during the retreat, and were unceasingly occupied. About fifteen hundred persons approached the holy communion. On the last day the Most Rev. Archbishop assisted at the high mass, celebrated by Rev. Alexius J. Elder, S. S. S.,

and on the same occasion he addressed the congregation, and concluded the ceremony by imparting the papal benediction.

Tribute to the memory of Rev. J. B. Gildea.—At a meeting of the board of managers on behalf of the congregation of the church of St. Vincent de Paul, held on Monday evening, February 24, at the residence of the late Rev. JOHN B. GILDEA, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Whereas it hath pleased Almighty God, in his infinite wisdom, to remove from this earthly scene to his most holy presence, in the meridian of a life of usefulness, and honor, and worth, and enjoying the esteem of a whole community, the Rev. John B. Gildea, the beloved pastor of St. Vincent de Paul's church—therefore

Resolved, by the board of the association of the church of St. Vincent de Paul, that, whilst they bow to the inscrutable mandate of a gracious Providence, they deeply sympathize with the relatives of the deceased, with the Most Rev. Archbishop Eccleston, the congregation of St. Vincent de Paul's, and the Catholic community in general.

Resolved, that in his demise the church has lost a zealous and efficient advocate, the fatherless and the widow a kind protector, mankind a sympathetic friend, and the world a good Christian.

Resolved, that as a mark of respect, the members of this board will wear crape for sixty days.

Resolved, that the foregoing proceedings be signed by the secretary of this board, and that copies of the same be transmitted to the Most Rev. Archbishop, to the Rev. Mr. Schreiber, to the Carmelite Nunnery, to St. Vincent's Male Orphan Asylum, and to the relatives of the deceased.

Lastly, Resolved, that these proceedings be published in the United States Catholic Magazine, and be entered on the minutes of the board of the association of St. Vincent de Paul.

Signed, JOHN I. GROSS, *Sec'y.*

☞ Want of space compels us to omit the resolutions of other meetings relative to the Rev. Mr. Gildea. They will appear in our next.

DIOCESS OF NEW ORLEANS.—On Sunday the 16th February, the corner-stone of a new church was laid in New Orleans, by the Right Rev. Bishop Blanc. The church is to be erected on the lot of the episcopal residence.—*Prop Cath.*

DIOCESS OF PHILADELPHIA.—*Ordination.*—On Sunday last the sacred order of priesthood was conferred in the cathedral by the bishop, on Rev. HUGH MCLOUGHLIN, Rev. JOHN CHARLES FLANAGAN, and Rev. WILLIAM FRANCIS JENKINS.—*Catholic Herald.*

DIOCESS OF NATCHES.—The Right Rev. Dr. Chanche, who recently visited Havana, in quest of documents relative to his diocess, which was formerly under the jurisdiction of the Spanish authorities, is said to have discovered some papers of great interest to the church in Mississippi.

DIOCESS OF VINCENNES.—*The Rev. Romain Weinzœphlin.*—The friends of truth and justice will be delighted to learn that this innocent and much injured individual has been at length released from his confinement, and that he is now in the full enjoyment of his freedom. The reprieve of the governor of Indiana reached Jeffersonsville on the evening of the 24th inst., and the Rev. M. Weinzœphlin was liberated immediately afterwards. We are able to say that the *only* reason alleged by his friends for his release was the firm conviction, resting on the strongest possible evidence, that he was entirely innocent of the grievous charge preferred against him; and also that this conviction induced the governor of Indiana to grant the reprieve, which would have been accepted on no other condition. The release of our worthy and suffering brother was thus but a simple act of tardy justice.

As far as we know, there has been, ever since the date of his imprisonment, but one opinion among the intelligent and unprejudiced on the subject, and that opinion has been an ever growing conviction of his entire innocence. It is surely honorable to the Catholic church, that her doctrines can not be attacked without misrepresentation, nor her ministers without calumny. Far from injuring either M. Weinzœphlin or our church, his unjust imprisonment will greatly benefit both.—*Catholic Advocate.*

THE CHURCH IN MARYLAND.—The Montreal Courier publishes a letter from a gentleman travelling in the United States, dated Hagerstown, January 20, of which the following is an extract.—*Banner of the Cross.*

Although this state was originally settled by Lord BALTIMORE and Roman Catholics, yet in the country districts there are but few Roman Catholic families: indeed the only Romanist family of note are the CARROLLS of Carrolton. Many of that family now belong to the Episcopal church, and to the honor of Maryland, at the revolution, not an acre of church of England property was confiscated, nor a single church desecrated. The churches and property attached to them then, now belong to the Episcopal church.

In this paragraph the travelling informant of the *Montreal Courier* (like most other travellers, who undertake to write about matters in relation to which they have cared very little to obtain correct data) has committed two mistakes, which deserve to be noticed; the more so, as certain Protestant prints in this country are not backward in endorsing such erroneous statements. In the first place, it is not true that "in the country districts" of Maryland there are "but few Roman Catholic families." In several counties of the state there are large numbers of Catholics spread through the

country, as in Baltimore co., Harford, Frederick, Cecil, Prince George's, Charles and St. Mary's counties. In the two last mentioned a great proportion of the inhabitants are members of the Catholic church.

Nor is it true that the only "Romanist family of note are the Carrolls of Carrolton." If by families of note the writer means such as occupy a prominent position in society, very many of this character could be enumerated. Many of the Catholic families in the state of Maryland are the direct descendants of the first colonists who emigrated under Lord Baltimore; and if several other Catholic families who came to the country at that period, subsequently renounced their faith, it was in consequence of the bitter persecution which the Episcopalians had excited against them, and by which they overthrew that glorious charter of civil and religous freedom which the Catholic colonists had established, and the enjoyment of which they had nobly offered to the professors of every other creed. Maryland would now in all probability be almost entirely Catholic, if a violent Episcopalian persecution had not thinned the numbers of the Catholic clergy, and, in thus depriving the laity of all religious facilities, caused them in this way, as well as by the most oppressive restrictions, gradually to abandon the faith of their ancestors. Many families however persevered in their religious principles, and their descendants are still living in different parts of the state, distinguished for their intelligence, patriotism and virtue.

But among the "families of note" in the state of Maryland, if such a thing must be noticed, for the purpose of showing that Catholicity has its adherents and admirers in every condition of life, we may observe that there are many now professing the Catholic faith, that were not forced to embrace it by any civil or religious oppression, but led to it by the deliberate conviction that it is the religion originally established by Christ. There is no station or profession in life which its members do not adorn; there is no department of public usefulness in which they do not take an active and important part: there are no qualities or attainments that elevate the character of man, either in domestic, social, or political life, of which they do not possess a considerable share. We often see it stated in Protestant papers, and we believe it to be an opinion generally entertained among our dissenting brethren, that the Catholics of this country consist almost entirely of emigrants. Nothing however could be more false. A very large proportion of the Catholic population consists of converts; and a great number of them are individuals of prominence in society. It is unnecessary here to mention names; but we are prepared to do so when the occasion demands it.

Spiritual Retreats.—The Very Rev. J. Timon, visiter of the Congregation of the Missions in the United States, recently conducted a retreat at Mobile for the faithful of that city, which was very successful. On the 13th of March, he was to open another course of spiritual exercises at Natchez, for the Catholics of that place.

To our Readers and Correspondents.—The article which has been published in this number on the *Sabbath Question* rather exceeds the limits which we wish to observe in our papers; but it was difficult, considering the importance of the subject, to treat it satisfactorily within a narrower compass. The writer has imbodied in this paper a vast deal of excellent information, which will amply repay an attentive perusal.

We have received from our gifted correspondent, S. R. T., a poem on the *Month of May*, which is truly a gem of its kind, and a beautiful tribute to that genial month, whose inspiration is so much enhanced and elevated by Catholic piety.

Another article has reached us, entitled *The great Schism of the West.* It is a review of Mr. Bonnechose's "Introduction to D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation," or *The Reformers before the Reformation.*

In our next number will appear a review of *Palmer's Letters to Dr. Wiseman*, on the charge of idolatry, with a variety of other matter.

OBITUARY.

Died, on the 4th of February, at St. Mary's college, Perryville, Rev. J. B. Robert, priest of the Congregation of the Mission. This lamented ecclesiastic was born in the diocess of Lyons, France, in 1800. He came to America in 1835, with some French and Italian clergymen, accompanied by Bishop Odin, and entered into the novitiate of the Congregation of the Mission in 1836, after which he consecrated himself to God and joined the Congregation of Missions, of which he was a very useful and edifying member. The virtues with which he especially edified his brethren were his profound humility and laborious life.

On the 12th of February, Rev. Augustin De Angelis, formerly pastor of St. Charles', in the diocess of New Orleans.—*Prop. Cath.*

In November last, at Havre, France, the Rev. Nicholas Fort, recently arrived from the diocess of New Orleans, with the hope of recovering his health, which had been greatly impaired by the labors of the holy ministry and a life of sacrifices.

In Charleston, South Carolina, yesterday (Good-Friday), at about 3 P. M., the Rev. Patrick Kenny, aged twenty-three years and ten months, a clergyman of the diocess of New York.—*Catholic Miscellany.*

The Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and other principal Saints, compiled from original monuments and other authentic records, &c. By the Rev. Alban Butler, vol. i. Baltimore: Metropolitan Press. 8vo. pp. 184.

The first volume of this publication has been received. The excellency of this work of the Rev. Alban Butler, as a record of the fruits of Catholic sanctity in every age since the commencement of the Christian era, and as an incentive to imitate the example of those who have been most distinguished for their virtue, is universally admitted, and this alone would be a sufficient reason to welcome the publication of the present edition. But when we consider that this will be the only complete edition of the work from the American press, and that the entire cost will not exceed three dollars, or twenty-five cents a volume, we have abundant reason to congratulate the Catholic community on being enabled to provide themselves with so valuable a production, at so little cost.

The Sinner's Guide, in two books. By the Rev. F. Lewis of Grenada. Translated from the Spanish. Philadelphia: Henry McGrath. 8vo. pp. 400.

Of all books on spirituality in the English language which have for their object to lead man to the practice of virtue, that called the *Sinner's Guide*, by F. Lewis de Grenada, is certainly the most excellent. The motives which are capable of inspiring the soul with a desire to serve God are here set forth at length, and with a persuasiveness and eloquence of style which are rarely met with in works of this description. It is gratifying to perceive that this valuable work has been republished with a greater regard to typographical neatness than was bestowed upon former editions. The present issue is in every respect worthy the attention and patronage of the Catholic community.

On the Life and Institute of the Jesuits. By the Rev. Father de Ravignan, of the Company of Jesus, carefully translated from the fourth edition of the French, by Charles Seager, M. A., formerly scholar of Worcester college, Oxford, &c. Philadelphia: W. J. Cunningham. 18mo. pp. 180.

The first principle of justice requires that no one should be condemned without a hearing; and in no country on the face of the earth is this privilege more jealously secured to the citizen than in the United States, at least so far as the formalities of law are necessary. But the principles of justice are binding, not only in regard to matters which are brought before our civil tribunals; they are obligatory in all the relations of public and private life, and forbid us to form a judgment derogatory to the character of our neighbor, without sufficient evidence to authorize such an opinion. Let this rule be observed in reference to that body of men, who are so industriously maligned at the present day, by a motly crowd of infidels and errorists of every description. The most shameful means are resorted to for calumniating the Jesuits. The more imposing forms of serious discussion having been found unavailable, the more attractive and effectual method of the novelist has been adopted for poisoning the public mind, and disseminating the vilest falsehoods against a society whose members have unquestionably ranked, for the last three hundred years, among the most illustrious benefactors of the human race. Our American literature has been recently disgraced by a work called the *Jesuit*, and by Eugene Sue's *Wandering Jew*, both of which are directed against the Society of Jesus. We trust that the enlightened portion of our fellow-citizens, and all who have a regard for the claims of justice, will not suffer themselves to be duped by these base fabrications, especially when they possess the means of obtaining correct information in reference to the subject of which they treat. The book before us is a simple statement of facts, and can not fail to vindicate triumphantly the character of the Jesuits, as a body devoted to the advancement of religion, morality, and science.

Gelobt sey Jesus Christus; ein Gebetbuch für fromme Christen, &c., mit Gutheissung des hochwürdigsten Ertzbishofs von Baltimore. Baltimore: John Murphy. 32mo. pp. 448.

This is the neatest German prayer book that has ever come under our notice. It is printed on good substantial paper, in clear type, suited to all classes of readers, and contains a great variety of devotions. We understand that the publication has been conducted under the direction of the reverend fathers of the Congregation of the Holy Redeemer, or, as they are commonly called, the Redemptorists, and consequently it must be adapted to the wants of the German Catholics in the United States. We perceive in this book what we never discovered in any other German prayer book, the *Lord's prayer, the angelical salutation, and the creed*, which are generally omitted, in the supposition that every body knows them. In this country, however, many persons study the German language whose vernacular tongue is English, and they will find it a great convenience to possess the above mentioned prayers in German. The book before us, in addition to its general neatness of execution, contains four very handsome steel engravings, and numerous woodcuts illustrative of the sacrifice of the mass.

The Following of Christ in four books. By Thomas à Kempis, &c., with the Reflections and Prayers at the end of each chapter. Baltimore: John Murphy. 48mo. pp. 551.

The public will find in this stereotype edition of the *Following of Christ* a convenience which its predecessors do not possess, being reduced to a very portable size, which is a great consideration in a book that is sufficiently important to be made a pocket companion. It is neatly printed, and sold at a very moderate price.

Lectures on the invocation of saints, veneration of sacred images, and purgatory. By the Rev. Charles Constantine Pise, D.D. New York: Henry G. Daggers. 8vo. pp. 67.

The lectures here given to the public were kindly sent to us by the esteemed author, whose pen never wearies or exhausts itself in the noble effort to explain and vindicate the tenets of our holy faith. These lectures of Dr. Pise had already attracted considerable attention before they were published in pamphlet form, and we are happy to perceive that they have been placed within the reach of all who desire to be enlightened on the subjects of which they treat. To those who will peruse them we promise no small share of instruction and entertainment.

Evangelical Life of Christ, by the Rev. Henry Rutter. N. York: R. Martin & Co. 4to.

Part XIV of this valuable work has been received. It is embellished with an engraving of St. Mary Magdalen.

The second Annual Report of the Physician of Mount Hope Hospital, (late Mount St. Vincent,) Baltimore, for 1844. Baltimore: Metropolitan Press. 12mo. pp. 27.

We are indebted to the politeness of the attending physician of Mount Hope Hospital for a copy of this report, the contents of which are of great interest to the community at large. The reader will here find detailed the advantages which may accrue to individuals afflicted with mental derangement, from institutions that are provided with the necessary arrangements for the treatment of this disease under its various forms. Were no other evidence at hand to demonstrate the truth of this, the eminent success which has been met with among the patients of Mount Hope Hospital, would be amply sufficient. From the statements of the report, we learn that, in the course of the last year, ninety-eight patients enjoyed the benefits of the institution in the insane department, fifty males, forty-eight females. Sixty-three were admitted during the year. Of the patients above mentioned, six died, thirty-nine were cured, and thirty-two were improved. The following extract from the report will be found interesting:

"In presenting the second annual report of this institution, we would fail to express the feelings of our heart, if we did not offer our profound and grateful acknowledgments to the Supreme Author of our blessings for the many distinguished mercies we have received during the course of the past year. To a merciful Providence we owe it, that the members of our extensive household, averaging about one hundred souls, have enjoyed a very remarkable exemption from any general disease, and that the friends of our patients have been summoned so seldom to mourn the death of those committed to our charge. It also affords us unfeigned pleasure to report a freedom from any accident of a serious nature, though we have at all times in the house one or more patients laboring under the suicidal form of mania.

"From the period of our last report, until the early part of May last, we continued at Mount St. Vincent's, but the property known as Mount Hope college having been purchased by the Sisters in April, our patients were removed there as soon as the arrangements necessary for their comfort were completed. Immediately on effecting this purchase, much expense was incurred in thoroughly repairing its buildings, and in making such alterations as were required in order to adapt it to the purposes of a general hospital. And in bringing every portion of this extensive building into requisition and use, we entertained the belief that ample provision would then be made for the accommodation of all who might apply for admission for at least ten years. The short space of eight months, the period during which Mount Hope has been occupied by us, has been sufficient to exhibit the fallacy of a calculation so reasonable. In less than six months the house was so crowded that we were compelled to reject applications. Patients have flocked to us from sections of the country as remote as New Orleans, Natchez, St. Louis, &c., as the column in the table indicating their residence will show. The cause, doubtless, of this gratifying preference of this institution, is the high estimation in which are held the services and self-denying attentions of the Sisters. For this institution is the only one of the kind in the United States in which the Sisters of Charity are untrammelled and unrestrained in the performance of their offices of self-sacrifice for the benefit of the often neglected lunatic. The friends of the insane possess the assurance that nothing bordering on harshness could be tolerated by them; and that a conscientious desire to improve the condition of all within the sphere of their influence—to increase the happiness and mitigate the sufferings of each and all—does in truth constitute the all-pervading and governing motive of their conduct. This unexpected influx of patients, whilst it afforded evidence of a degree of public confidence most gratifying and encouraging, pointed also to the necessity of providing for their accommodation by the erection of additional buildings. As the necessity was pressing, measures were adopted without delay for erecting a wing to the west end, to correspond with the present eastern wing, and to enlarge as well as materially alter the whole of the centre building. As a preparatory measure, two of the Sisters and the physician were sent to Philadelphia for the purpose of viewing the improvements lately introduced into the institutions there. Thus prepared by a personal observation of their well-tried expedients and plans, we are enabled to enter upon the work of constructing the new buildings with much more confidence, and to much greater advantage. The basement of the new wing has already been excavated, and the stonework finished. The further progress of the work will now be arrested for the winter, and resumed immediately on the opening of spring. In addition to the new wing already mentioned, the plan contemplates the erection of a new front to the centre, having a projection of twelve feet beyond the wings, with an additional story surmounted by an elegant cupola. The architect of these improvements is our enterprising and talented fellow-citizen, Robert C. Long, Esq. When the whole shall be completed, the building will present from its commanding position a most imposing appearance; and from every window, a vast and beautiful prospect will open to the view, well calculated to please the eye, to cheer the heart, or soothe the ravings of the unhappy subjects of mental delusion who may here take up their abode."—Pp. 14, 15.

Besides the insane department of this institution, arrangements have been made for the accommodation of patients laboring under general diseases, and it is most gratifying to perceive that the establishment has been equally prosperous in this department as in that above mentioned. During the first year of its existence, only thirty-one persons were admitted; during the last year, the number amounted to eighty-five, and not a single fatal case occurred among them; all recovered. The institution has also been very useful in affording a retreat to certain individuals advanced in years, who, in consideration of a specified sum, have obtained a life support within its precints, with all the advantages of a comfortable home, including boarding, clothing, and medical attendance when requisite.

Review of D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation. By Dr. Spalding.

We take pleasure in announcing that this work will be shortly republished, and that the second edition will be considerably enlarged by the author, and the style of it thoroughly revised.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 25064 3

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON